

MYSORE HOUSING BOARD BILL, 1954.

Motion to consider (Contd).

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now the debate on Mysore Housing Board Bill will continue.

*SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM (Jagalur).—Sir, I am not going to take much time of this House over this Bill. Sir, a few members have welcomed this Bill, and a few have expressed their doubts regarding the utility of this Bill. Personally, I feel doubtful whether such a measure is necessary at all, and whether it will not be superfluous. It is true, by passing this Bill we will be giving the Government power to appoint their own body, a Corporation consisting of their own nominees. As pointed out by Sri A. Bheemappa Naik, neither the Chairman nor the members will be responsible to this House, and the entire Corporation will be the corporation of the Government. It is stated that such a Corporation, such a Housing Board is necessary for two objects. Firstly, it is necessary to implement the Five-Year Programme, and secondly, it is said that such a body is necessary in order to take care that the entire amount allotted to it by the Centre is received and spent by this body. Sir, it is nearly three years since that the Five-Year Plan came into existence. Three years have elapsed. During these three years, various bodies have been at this problem and have been working at this problem. During these years, there have been other agencies and other bodies attending to this problem and doing work. Why this proposal came at such a time is a thing I cannot understand. Till now, the work of implementing and tackling of the housing problem was entrusted to various bodies. It was entrusted to the Trust Board, to a Corporation and recently a body called the Labour Housing Corporation was created and they have done some work. I will just read a few facts and figures supplied to us by the Government regarding the work carried out by these bodies.

“The Five-Year Plan of Mysore provides for the construction of

2,500 houses for housing labour in the cities of Mysore, Bangalore and Davangere at the rate of 500 houses per year and a provision of 40 lakhs has been made.”

I am not sure how much of this amount has been spent and to what extent various houses have been constructed. In the next paragraph, it is stated:

“Under the Industrial Labour Housing Scheme formulated by the Government of India, 240 labour quarters have been built at Rajaji Nagar by the City Improvement Trust Board, Bangalore. These quarters have since been handed over to the Mysore Labour Housing Corporation which was constituted in 1952 for the implementation of the Scheme of Labour Housing in the State.

“The Labour Housing Corporation drew up a programme of work for 1953-54 for the construction of 3,400 houses, including the construction of 400 houses, each for the Hindustan Aircraft, Ltd., and Indian Telephone Industries. These concerns have made their own arrangements for construction of houses for their labour.

“Under the Subsidised Industrial Housing Scheme, the Government of India have approved schemes during 1953-54 and have sanctioned necessary financial aid therefor.....”

So there have been competent agencies to carry on this work till now.

Why I am objecting to the formation of this new Corporation is this. It involves unnecessary expenditure. It is stated in the Statement of Objects and Reasons that the Government has to contribute every year a sum not less than two lakhs towards establishment charges of this Corporation and towards the staff. That is only in the initial stage. In course of time, it may be, that the Government may have to incur more and more expenditure. So there will be duplication of agencies, if the

Corporation is appointed under the Statute, i.e., you will be having the Housing Board and then the City Improvement Trust Board, and you will be having various local bodies, and this Corporation under the constitution will also be a local body. As such, I feel that there will be duplication of agencies with extra expenditure and very little work. If we compare the provisions of the present Bill with the City Improvement Act, Trust Board Act, we find practically similar provisions in both. The City Improvement Act also empowers the Trust Board to undertake exactly similar nature of work. Under the City Improvement Act, the Trust Board is at liberty to acquire property, to lay-out and re-lay sites. They can acquire property and they can clean slums and they can undertake construction of houses. Exactly similar powers are conferred on both these bodies. So, why not the City Improvement Trust Board itself be entrusted with this work, and why incur unnecessary extra expenditure by the creation of this Corporation, of this Housing Board? I feel that creation of such a body will be superfluous. It will not be helpful. On the other hand, having too many agents may spoil the progress. In fact when the Housing Board comes into existence, they will say that the Trust Board will have to do certain things, and Trust Board in turn may say that the Housing Board should carry on certain work. As such, there may not be smooth progress of work, especially when the duties and functions of both the bodies are similar. It may be stated that the jurisdiction of this Housing Board extends throughout the State, whereas the jurisdiction of the City Improvement Trust Boards is confined only to the cities of Bangalore or Mysore. But I may submit that the primary function of the Housing Board will be to confine themselves to the building of houses in big cities like Bangalore, Mysore and Davangere, whereas the other places will be neglected.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO (Minister for Law and Education).—We are building even now houses at T.-Narasipur.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Because that is under the Labour Corporation. The activities of this Housing Board will be confined to big places or to such of the places where there are industrial concerns.....

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Not at all; it is to widen the scope that the present Bill has been brought.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—In that case, I may submit that its scope may be widened to say that it will be extended throughout the State, to all industrial suburbs where housing accommodation has to be provided to the labour population. So, in such cases, I feel that instead of too many agencies, such work may be entrusted to the local bodies. If it is desired to undertake housing in places like Davangere or Chitaldrug or T.-Narasipur, I would ask, why not entrust the work to local bodies and to municipalities?

Whatever grant is available, please transfer that to these local bodies and ask them to construct houses and give them the necessary facilities. But to ask the Board to exercise jurisdiction over the entire State means, I think, in the first place that they cannot concentrate their attention on any particular place. Their jurisdiction will be far beyond the area which they can manage. And what is more, it will be involving us in unnecessary expenditure.

Sir, I must submit another thing. If I go through the provisions of this Bill, it is seen that this is more or less a business concern. The Board will be appointed; it will get whatever grant or subvention is given by the Government; then it constructs the houses and then these houses are perhaps going to be rented out or let out at reasonable rents. But what I envisage is this: this housing problem must be taken as a bigger question. Till now it is confined only to providing houses to the industrial labour or to people living in cities. But what the Five Year Plan contemplates is to tackle the problem of housing shortage throughout the State and this problem affects not merely the labour population or the industrial population but the entire rural population including the entire agriculturist classes. It must be

(SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.)

admitted that one of the important problems which Government have to tackle is the housing problem. It must be admitted that throughout the State a large number of poor people, millions of poor people, hundreds and thousands of poor families are without houses and without any kind of habitation. I may state that there are thousands of families who have no habitation at all, who have no housing accommodation at all. Perhaps their only shelter is the sky. There are any number of such families. Again I may point out that there are hundreds and thousands of people who are living in thatched huts, living in houses which are inflammable. It is not uncommon that accidents occur every year; perhaps it should have come to the notice of the Government itself that every year, hundreds and hundreds of houses and thatched huts become victims of fire accidents. Recently we had an accident at some place which created great harm. It is true that thousands of families are exposed to this danger of fire accidents. Till now neither this Government nor the Central Government have thought of tackling this problem. And what about the existing housing facilities in rural areas, at any rate, of the agricultural population concerned? They are living in dingy, ill-ventilated and dirty houses. I think that large number of people are being crowded in small rooms with great discomfort to themselves and to the members of the families. It is true that the Government is doing its best to provide housing facilities to depressed classes and the industrial labour people. But I may also point out that there are hundreds and thousands of families who are in a similar position as the depressed class people or scheduled castes people. I may point out instances of other communities like Bestars, Bedars and agricultural classes having no houses at all. I wish the Hon'ble the Minister made a thorough survey of the labour population in rural areas. You will find that so many of them are living miserable lives. Their health is spoiled. They have not got even little comforts. So

this problem must be viewed as a larger issue. Government should think of providing housing facilities not only to a particular section or the industrial labour or the scheduled classes but to others also, taking it as a bigger issue, as it is being done in some western countries. For example, in England, they have got what is called the National Housing Scheme. It is the duty of the Government to see that every family is provided with a decent house. In 1949 the Government undertook the construction of 2,50,000 houses for the sake of the poor. So Government must view this as a bigger problem and must consider how to tackle this problem. At present their activities are merely confined to one or two sections. But this will not solve the housing shortage problem. What I feel is this. This Bill is intended to be for the entire State; but the activities will be confined to only big places or industrial suburbs. The rural population.....

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It is just to remedy that state of affairs this is brought in.

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I am rather doubtful about it.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I wish the Hon'ble member goes through the provisions carefully.

SRI J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Power is given to the Government to extend it to such other places as they consider it necessary. What I mean is this. The entire problem must be viewed as a State problem. The entire housing scheme must be viewed as housing all the poor and the agricultural population. If it is viewed in that spirit, then I think it is worthwhile giving the Board wide powers.....

MR. SPEAKER.—The Hon'ble Member must have read in today's papers that nearly Rs. 7 lakhs are granted by the Central Government in the form of subsidy and Rs. 7 lakhs as loan so far as house building is concerned in Rajaji Nagar.

SRI V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—In the Statement of Objects and Reasons itself it is clearly stated that the scheme is intended to give relief to all needy sections of the population and I do not know why the

Hon'ble Member is simply going on saying....

Mr. SPEAKER.—In the rural areas, he is saying.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Just to clarify the position, though already discussed, I wish to invite the attention of the Hon'ble Leader of the Opposition to clause 23 of the Bill which says—

“Subject to the provisions of this Act and subject to the control of the State Government, the Board may incur expenditure and undertake works in any area to which this Chapter applies for the framing and execution of such housing schemes as it may consider necessary from time to time, or as may be entrusted to it by the State Government.”

So the housing scheme was till now confined only to the industrial area and the industrial labour; the progress achieved is already before you, and as I have explained, the scheme will be extended to all other parts, namely, village panchayats, municipalities and the Corporation area. To enable them to remedy the present defect in the Housing Corporation Act, this has been brought forward. Just to clarify the position I have said this.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—I only expressed my apprehension that for the new scheme only big places will be preferred. I pointed out that till now all these rural areas have been neglected and the rural housing problem has not at all engaged the attention of the Government. If the Government gives the assurance that the rural housing problem also will be included, then I will be glad. But what I submit is this. Government must make a survey of this problem. It is a problem of very great magnitude. In fact I would give first preference to rural areas and allot whatever amount is available towards the upliftment of the rural areas. But, as I said, the Government must make a survey of the entire State and prepare a programme, find out what amount is needed and extend relief to all parts. With that object in view, if the Board undertakes this work, then I will welcome the object.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I may assure the Hon'ble Member that if he has got any scheme, Government will certainly consider it.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Government must prepare the scheme.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Very well.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—As I said, the Government must make a survey of the rural parts and find out the actual housing need in the rural areas. Till now it has not provided facilities in rural areas. All their efforts and activities are confined to industrial areas and big areas. Villages are not tackled. That is why I submit that the Government must get a survey made of the entire State in connection with housing needs, know what it would cost, prepare a comprehensive scheme and programme and entrust the work to this Board. So far as cities are concerned, I may even suggest that this Board may be rid of the responsibility for housing in bigger areas, because there are already other agencies, for example, Trust Boards. They have got responsibility to do similar work. You have got the Mysore City Improvement Trust Board. It will look after the housing problem in Mysore City. In Bangalore City there is the City Improvement Trust Board and it will look after the housing needs in the city. You should work to devote your energy towards implementing the Five-Year Programme and provide housing facilities and give the much needed facility in rural areas.

So, Sir, with these observations, I do not seriously object to the Bill. I know the Government have brought up this bill with good intention. But I am afraid that, in practical working, it may be negated on account of administrative difficulties. In the first place, I said there will be a duplication of agencies. Either they must abolish the Trust Board or ask the Trust Board to devote itself entirely to cities and ask this Board to devote its attention to the rural areas. That is all my point.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ (ಹಿರಿಯೂರು).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ 1954ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬಿಲ್ಲ್ಯನ್ನು ನಾನು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

(ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.)

ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ದೇಶದಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಿಟಿಗಳು, ನಗರಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಕಾಲಗಾರರು ಎಲ್ಲ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರುತ್ತಾರೆಯೋ ಅಂಥ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾತ್ರ ವಾಸದ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅನುಕೂಲತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು ಎಂಬುದು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜನರ ಮುಖ್ಯ ವಾದ ಒಂದು ಕೊರತೆ, ಒಂದು ನೋವು ಆಗಿತ್ತು. ಅವರು ಕೇಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಬಾಯಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಅಥವಾ ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಮೇಲೆ ತಮ್ಮ ಪ್ರಭಾವವನ್ನು ಬೀರಿ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವನ್ನು ಪಡೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಶಕ್ತಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇಲ್ಲಿಯವರೆಗೂ ಆ ಕೊರತೆಯನ್ನು, ನೋವನ್ನು ಬಹಳವಾಗಿ ಅನುಭವಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದರು. ಆದರೆ ಈಚೆಗೆ ಕೆಲವಾರು ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಂಥ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕೊರತೆಯನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿಯೋ ಅನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಕೊನೆಗೆ ತಡವಾಗಿ ಆದರೂ ಕೂಡ ತಂದರಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನಾನು ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ತೊಂದರೆಯಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕವರ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಸಂತೋಷವನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಪಟ್ಟಣಗಳಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಬೇರೆ ದೊಡ್ಡದೊಡ್ಡ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕಾ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷವಾದಂಥ ತೊಂದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯಲ್ಲಿದೆ. ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ಗ್ರಾಮ ಬಡಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ, ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು, ಚರಂಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಪಂಚಾಯಿತಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಡಕು ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪಾರ್ಷ್ವಗಳು ಮತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಜಮೀನು ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಪ್ರಾಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿದ್ದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಜಮೀನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗದೆ 10 ವರ್ಷ, 12 ವರ್ಷ, 15 ವರ್ಷಗಳಿಗೂ ಮೇಲ್ಪಟ್ಟು ಅಕ್ವೈಸಿಷನ್ ರೆಕಾರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳು ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ಪೆಂಡಿಂಗ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಇದ್ದು, ಆ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದೇ ಅಸೆಂಬ್ಲಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳ ಸುರಿಮಳೆ ಆದದ್ದು ಎಲ್ಲರಿಗೂ ಗೊತ್ತಿದೆ. ಹೀಗಾಗಿ ಅನೇಕ ಗ್ರಾಮಗಳ ಬಡಾವಣೆಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಮತ್ತು ಹೊಸ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಜನೆಗಳಾಗಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಶೋಚನೀಯ ಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅನಿವಾರ್ಯವಾಗಿ ರೈತರು ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯ ಮೂರು ದಿಕ್ಕಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೂಡ attachment ಹಾಕಿಕೊಂಡು ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಯಾವುದಾದರೂ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಗೆ ಬೆಂಕಿ ಬಿದ್ದ ಪಕ್ಷದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದರಿಂದ ಒಂದು ಹತ್ತಿಕೊಂಡು ಹತ್ತಾರು ಮನೆಗಳು ನಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಸಾವಿರಾರು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಳೆದುಕೊಂಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ರೈತರು ಇದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ರೀತಿ ನಷ್ಟವಾಗುತ್ತಾ ಇರುವುದನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷ ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದೇವೆ. ಈಗಲಾದರೂ ಈ ಒಂದು ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ಬಗೆಹರಿಸಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯಲ್ಲ, ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶ ಒದಗುತ್ತಿದೆಯಲ್ಲ ಎಂಬುದು ಒಂದು ಸಂತೋಷದ ಸಂಗತಿ. ಈ ಒಂದು ಮನೂದಾ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯವರು ಗ್ರಾಮದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಬಡಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ಹೊಸ ಗ್ರಾಮ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು ಅಥವಾ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಬೇಕಾದ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ, ಅಲೈನ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು, ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ವಿಶಾಲ

ವಾದ ಜಾಗಗಳನ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅವರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ಬಂದ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಕ್ರಮವಾದ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು, ಪ್ಲಾನ್‌ನನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿ, ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರುಗಳ ಮೂಲಕ ರೇ-ಬಿಟು, ಎಸ್ಟಿಮೇಟ್ ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿಸಿ, ಅಕ್ವೈಸಿಷನ್ ಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ನೇಮಕವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಒಂದು ಕಮಿಟಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಅಕ್ವೈಸಿಷನ್ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ—ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಅಡಚಣೆ ಇದ್ದರೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವೆಲ್ಲವನ್ನೂ ಮೀರಿ, ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಕೆರೆ ಕಾಂಗಾರಿ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಮರಾಮತ್ತಿ ಇರಾಖೆಯವರು ದೊಡ್ಡದೊಡ್ಡ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಅಕ್ವೈಸಿಷನ್ ಕ್ರಮ ನಡೆಸಿ ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿನ ಸಹ ಗ್ರಾಮ ಬಡಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಸ್ವಾಧೀನ ಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೊಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಆಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮ ಹರಿಜನ ಮಿತ್ರರು ಈ ಸಭೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ಸಾರಿಯೂ ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಇದ್ದಾರೋ ಅದು, ಎಂದರೆ, ಹರಿಜನರ ಕಾರೊನಿಗಳಿಗೆ, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್ ಕಾರೊನಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಜಮೀನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ತೊಂದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟಿದೆ ಅದು ಸುಲಭವಾಗಿ ಬಗೆ ಹರಿಯುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಚೆನ್ನಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದರೂ ಕೂಡ ರೈತರಲ್ಲಿ, ಜನಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸವಿಲ್ಲದೇ ಇರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದಂಥ ಕ್ರಮವಾದ, ನೋಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಲಕ್ಷಣವಾಗಿ ವಾಸಕ್ಕೆ ಯೋಗ್ಯವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ, ಬೆಳಕಿನಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ, ಸ್ಯಾನಿಟರಿ ರೂಲ್ಸ್‌ಗೆ ಅನುಸಾರವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡು ವಾಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾ ಇರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬಹಳ ಕಡಮೆ. ಎಷ್ಟೇ ಐಶ್ವರ್ಯವಂತರಾಗಿ ಇರತಕ್ಕವರಿಗೂ ಕೂಡ ಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವ ಅಭ್ಯಾಸ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅವರಿಗೆ ಯಾವಾಗಲೂ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ರಕ್ಷಣೆ ಬೇಕೋ ಏನೋ ಅನ್ನುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಟಿ ಗೋಡೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಕ್ರಮ ಬಂದಿದೆ. ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಹೇಳಿ ಅವರನ್ನು ನಾವು ಸುಧಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಬಹಳ ಕಾಲ ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದೇನೋ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮಾರ್ಗ, ಆದರೆ ಕಾಲ ಹಿಡಿಯುತ್ತದೆ. ಒಂದು ನಿರ್ಮಾಣತವಾದ ಕ್ರಮವನ್ನು ನುಸರಿಸಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಪದ್ಧತಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡು ಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ಕಾನೂನಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ type design building ಒಂದು ರೊಕ್ಕಾ ಲಿಟನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದು ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ತಯಾರು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಅದರಂತೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಜಾಗ ಪಡೆಯತಕ್ಕವರು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು, ಅದರಿಂದ ಜನಗಳು ಆರೋಗ್ಯಯುತವಾದ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ವಾಸ ಮಾಡಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ವಿಚಾರಗಳು ಇವೆ. ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸ್ಯಾಗತಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಾ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಇಮಾರಂವರು ಇದು ಬರೀ ನಗರಾಭಿವೃದ್ಧಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾಗಬಹುದು ಅಥವಾ ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಲೇಬರ್ areasನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾಣಸೆಂಟ್ರೀಟ್ ಆಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬ ಒಂದು ಭಯ ಅಥವಾ ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸಿದರು. ಆ ಒಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯದಲ್ಲಿ ನಾನೂ ಕೂಡ ನನ್ನ ಸಮ್ಮತಿಯನ್ನು ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ.

ಈ ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವುದು ಎಂದು ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸಚಿವರೇನೋ ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು. Statement

of Objects and Reasons ಮತ್ತು ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 23ರಲ್ಲಿ ಇದು ಅಡಕವಾಗಿದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರು. ಆ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಓದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಅದಕ್ಕೆ ಬಹಳ ಸಂತೋಷವುಂಟು. ಆದರೆ ಬರೀ ಅಷ್ಟು ಭಾಗಗಳಿಂದಲೇ ನಮಗೆ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಒದಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ನಂಬಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲಿಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡುವವರು ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು, ಮತ್ತು ಹಣ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರ ಕೈಯಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಈ ಎರಡರ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಅವರು ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಚಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಅವಕಾಶ ಇದೆ. ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೇ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಆ ಹಣ ಯಾವತ್ತೂ ಕೂಡ—ಈ ಒಸಿಫರಸ್ ಎಲಮೆಂಟ್ ಎಂದು ಏನು ಹೇಳುತ್ತದೆ—ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಗಲಾಟೆ ಮಾಡಿ, ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಒತ್ತಾಯ ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು, ಲೇಬರ್ ಅಸೋಸಿಯೇಷನ್‌ಗಳು ಇಂತಹ ಇಂಡಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯಲ್ ಏರಿಯಾ, ಸಿಟಿಗಳು, ಟೌನ್‌ಗಳು ಅಲ್ಲಿಗೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಯಾವ ವಿಧವಾದ ಒಂದು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಆಗಲಿ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಾಗಲಿ ಒಂದು ಇಲ್ಲದೆ, ತೀವ್ರವಾಗಿ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿನವರಿಗೆ ಒದಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಅಷ್ಟಾಗಿ ಸೂಕ್ತವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ನನಗೆ ಅನ್ನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ.

2 P.M.

ಈ ಒಂದು ಭಯವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 23ರಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದಾಗಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಸ್ಟೇಟ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಆಫ್ ಆರ್ಟಿಕಲ್ಸ್ ಅಂಡ್ ರೀನನ್ಸನ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವುದಾಗಲಿ ಸಾಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ 6 ಜನರ ಒಂದು ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನು ನೇಮಕಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಪೋಸ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬದಲಾಗಿ 15 ಜನರನ್ನೊಳಗೊಂಡ ಸಮಿತಿಯನ್ನಾದರೂ ಮಾಡಿ ಪ್ರತಿಯೊಂದು ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿನಿಂದಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಯು ಈ ಸಮಿತಿಗೆ ಬರುವಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಿಂದ ದೊರೆಯಬಹುದಾದ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭಾಗ ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಉದ್ದೇಶವಾಗಿದೆ. ನಗರದವರಿಗೆ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿವೆ, ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಹಳ್ಳಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಇದರ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಂತೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲ ದೊರಕಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿನ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸೇರಿಸಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಳವರಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯುವುದಿಲ್ಲ ಮತ್ತು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಬರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಹಣದ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯವೇನಿದೆಯೋ ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಕೂಡ ಅದಷ್ಟು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಭಾಗವನ್ನು ಹಳ್ಳಿಯ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ, ಲೇ-ಔಟ್ ವಗೈರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲು ಅನುಕೂಲವಾಗುವಹಾಗೆ ಈ ಫಂಡುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ certain proportion will be set apart for rural purpose ಎಂದು ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಒಂದು ಭರವಸೆ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರದ ಪ್ರಜೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಹೋಗುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಎರಡು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಅಂಶಗಳನ್ನು ಸಮಿತಿಯವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಗ್ಯಾರಂಟಿ ಬರುವಹಾಗೆ ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು.

ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ನನಗೆ ಹೊಳೆಯುವ ಸಂದೇಹ. ಈ ಸ್ಕ್ರೀಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಮಾಡುವ ಸ್ಕ್ರೀಮು ಅಂಗೀಕಾರವಾದಮೇಲೆ ಕಾರ್ಯಗತಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಇಲಾಖೆಯ ಮೂಲಕವಾಗಿ, ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆ

ಮೂಲಕ ಅಥವಾ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವುದು ಕೆಲವು ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಲೇ-ಔಟ್ ಮತ್ತು ಪಬ್ಲಿಕ್ ವರ್ಕ್ಸ್ ಇಲಾಖೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಕಂಟ್ರಾಕ್ಟರ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಮಾಡಿಸಬಹುದು, ಆದರೆ ಲೇ-ಔಟ್ 100 ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟುವಾಗ ಯಾರಿಗಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತಾರೋ ಅವರಿಗೇ ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಅವರ ಮೂಲಕ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದರೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಏಕನಾಮಿಕವಾಗಿ ವರ್ಕ್‌ಆಫ್ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಕಡಮೆ ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಮತ್ತು ಮನೆಯೂ ಬಂದೋಬಸ್ತಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವುಕಡೆ ಮನೆಕಟ್ಟಿ 8-10 ಸಾವಿರ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಲು ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡಿರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆ ಮನೆಗಳು ಸಾಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಬಂದೋಬಸ್ತಾಗಿಲ್ಲ, ಹಣ ಖರ್ಚಾಗಿರುವಷ್ಟು ಬೆರೆಬಾಳುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿಲ್ಲ, ಅತ್ಯಪ್ರೀತರವಾಗಿವೆ, ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿಲ್ಲ ಎಂದು ಆ ಮನೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವವರು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶಗಳಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಕೇಳಿದ್ದೇವೆ; ಹಾಗಾಗಬಾರದು. ಅದರಲ್ಲೂ ಗ್ರಾಮಾಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟುವ ಮನೆಗಳ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಸಾರಿ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗರಿಗೆ ಅಪನಂಬಿಕೆ ಬಂದರೆ ಅದನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆಮಾಡುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಕಷ್ಟ. ಈ ರೀತಿಯಾದ ಅನುಪಾನ, ಅಪನಂಬಿಕೆ ಬಂದಂತೆ, ಖರ್ಚಾಗುವ ಹಣಕ್ಕೆ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆ ಬೇಕೋ ಅದು ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅಡಕವಾಗುವ ಹಾಗೆ ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು, ಇದನ್ನು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಟ್ ಕಮಿಟಿ ಗಮನಿಸಬೇಕು ಎಂದು ಸಲಹೆಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು ಬೆಟರ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಹಾಕಲು ಒಂದು ಪ್ರಾವಿಷನ್ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಎರಡು ಪ್ರಶ್ನೆಗಳು ಕಾಣುತ್ತವೆ. ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಎಕ್ಸ್ಟೆಂಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಸಿಟಿಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಅಥವಾ ಟೌನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಡೈನೇಜ್ ಸಿಸ್ಟಂ ಮುಂತಾದವನ್ನು ಕೊಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ನ್ಯೂಯೇಜ್ ಮತ್ತು ವೇಸ್ಟ್ ವಾಟರ್ ಬರುವ ಸಂದರ್ಭ ಬರಬಹುದು. ಅದರಿಂದ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಇರಿಗೇಷನ್ ಅನುಕೂಲ ದೊರೆಯಬಹುದು. ಆಗ ಕೆಲವು ಜಮೀನುಗಳು ಉತ್ತಮ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಗೆ ಬರುವುದರಿಂದ ಆ ಜಮೀನುಗಳಿಗೆ ಬೆಟರ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಹಾಕುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ನ್ಯಾಯವಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಎಕ್ಸ್ಟೆಂಷನ್ ಅಥವಾ ಕಾರೋನಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ಕಾಲದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೆರೆ ಬರಬಹುದು—ಯಾವಾಗ ಬರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಗೊತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ, ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವವರು ಬರುವಾಗ ಬರಬಹುದು—ಆಗ ಅಂಥ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿರುವ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರುಗಳವರು ಬೆಟರ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಆ ಜಮೀನುದಾರರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಸ್ಕ್ರೀಂ ಮಾಡುವಾಗ ಈ ಒಂದು ವಿಶೇಷ ಸನ್ನಿವೇಶವನ್ನು ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶಮಾಡುವುದಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಅಂಥ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಪಡೆಯುವವರಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಬೆಟರ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫಾರ್ಜಸ್ ಹಾಕಬೇಕೇ ಹೊರತು ಹಾಗಿದ್ದರೆ ಈಗಿರುವ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಯೊಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಮುಂದೆ ಬೆರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಪ್ಯೂಜರ್ ಕಣ್ಣಿಗಿಟ್ಟು ಐಟಂ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಹಾಕಿದರೆ ಪಕ್ಕದ ಜಮೀನಿನವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ತೊಂದರೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್ 56ರಲ್ಲಿ application of the fund ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಬಹಳ ಜನರಲ್ಲಾಗಿದೆ, ಇದನ್ನು

(ಶ್ರೀ ವಿ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪ.)

ಗಮನಿಸಿ ಯಾವರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಛಾಂಪು ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಗ್ರಾಹಕರಂತರ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಅದನ್ನು ಹೇಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಿ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾದ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಜನರಲ್ಲಿ ನಂಬಿಕೆಯನ್ನುಂಟುಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೆಂದು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುವುದರ ಮೂಲಕ ಈ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಇಷ್ಟು ಹೇಳಿ ಒಟ್ಟಿನಮೇಲೆ ನಾನು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲನ್ನು ಸಂತೋಷದಿಂದ ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ರೈತವರ್ಗದಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ, ಅವರ ಪರವಾದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಲ್ಲಾಗಲಿ ಇರುವ ಶಂಕೆಯನ್ನು, ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯ ಅವರಿಗೆ ದೊರೆಯಲಾರದೆಂಬ ಸಂದೇಹವನ್ನು ಹೋಗಲಾಡಿಸಲು ಈ ಮನೋದಯಿ ಕೆಲವು ತಿದ್ದುಪಡಿಮಾಡಿ ಆ ಮೂಲಕ ಆ ಸಂದೇಹವನ್ನು ನಿವಾರಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯ ವ್ಯಕ್ತಪಡಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ (ಬಸವನಗುಡಿ). — ಈ ಮನೋದಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭದಲ್ಲಿ ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ಅಭಿನಂದಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಕೆಲವು ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಮನುಷ್ಯನಿಗೆ ಆಹಾರ, ಬಟ್ಟೆ, ಅನಂತರ ವಸತಿ ಎಂಬುದು ಅತ್ಯಂತ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆ. ಈಗ ಸೈರಾಜ್ಯ ಬಂದಮೇಲೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಮತ್ತು ಪ್ರಾಂತೀಯ ಸರ್ಕಾರಗಳು ಈ ವಸತಿ ಸೌಕರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಸೌಲಭ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಒಟ್ಟುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಪ್ರಯತ್ನಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈಗ ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತಂದಿರುವ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆ ಪ್ರಕಾರವಾಗಿ ಅವರು ಈ ವಸತಿಗಳ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ಆಲೋಚಿಸಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಮೂಲ್ಯವಾದಂಥ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಆ ಸಲಹೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದು ಮಾತ್ರವೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಲೆಕ್ಕಾಚಾರಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಎಷ್ಟು ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳಾಗಬೇಕೆಂದು ಲೆಕ್ಕಮಾಡಿ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಒಟ್ಟು 4,881.6 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಇಂದಿಯಾದಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ವಸತಿಗಳನ್ನು ಕಲ್ಪಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ವಿನಿಯೋಗಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಸೂಚಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ 3,850 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು, 'ಬಿ' ಸ್ಟೇಟ್‌ಗಳಿಗೆ 87.5 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮೈಸೂರಿಗೆ ಸಹ 52 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳನ್ನು ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿಗದಿ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಇದುವರೆಗೂ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುತ್ತಿರುವಂಥ ಒಂದು ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮವು ಒಂದು ಸುಪ್ರಸಂಗತವಾದಂಥ ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ ಯಾವುದೋ ಒಂದು ಬಗೆಯಾಗಿ ಇಂಗ್ಲೀಷಿನಲ್ಲಿ 'haphazard' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುತ್ತಿರುವಂತೆ ನಡೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಬರುತ್ತಿವೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನುರಿತಂಥ ಪ್ರಭುತ್ವ ಇರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಎಂದರೆ ಆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ಮುಂತಾದ ದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ವಿನೋದನು ಏರ್ಪಡಿಸುವ ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ ಅವರು ಅಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದಕ್ಕನುಗುಣವಾಗಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ವಾಸದ ಮನೆಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅವರು ಹೇಗೆ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಎಂಬ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಅಂಶವನ್ನೇ ನಾನು ಈ ಸಭೆಯ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತರಲು ಇಚ್ಛಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. — ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ

"The average number of persons per room was 0.76." ಹೀಗೆ ಆ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಸಾಧಾರಣವಾಗಿ ಇಬ್ಬರಿಗೊಂದು ರೂಂ ಅಥವಾ ಮನೆ ಇರುತ್ತದೆಯೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಆ ಇಂಗ್ಲೆಂಡ್ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಗೃಹ ವಸತಿಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಸ್ಕ್ವೀಂ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿ ಎಂತಲೇ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಆ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯವರು ಒಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದಂಥ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಅದರ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ವಸತಿ ಗೃಹಗಳ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಹೋಗುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಕಳೆದ ಮಹಾಯುದ್ಧದಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಮನೆಗಳು ನಾಶವಾಗಿ ಹೋದವು. ಅದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಈಗ ಅಲ್ಲೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇ ಒಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದಂಥ ಕಾರ್ಯಕ್ರಮಗಳನ್ನಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುತ್ತಾ ಬರುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

"During war, one house in every three were destroyed or damaged by enemy action. In 1951, a Ministry was formed for Housing. This Ministry is the Ministry of Housing and Local Government."

In April 1950 the Government announced that the programme for 1950-52 would provide for the completion of 200,000 of permanent houses in each of those years. In November 1951, the new Conservative Government announced the adoption of a target of 300,000 houses a year."

ಇಷ್ಟೇ ಅಲ್ಲದೆ—ಎಂದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಹೊಸ ಮನೆಗಳ ಕಾರ್ಯವೊಂದನ್ನೇ ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳದೆ ಹಳೇ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸಹ ರಿಪೇರಿಮಾಡಿಸುವುದು ಅಥವಾ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಕೆಲಸ ಕಾರ್ಯಗಳಿಗೂ ಸಹ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ :

"By 31st December 1951, over one million new houses, permanent and temporary, had been built in Great Britain since early 1954, and about 226,000 more were under construction. The total number of families rehoused in this period (by new buildings, repair of uninhabitable houses and conversion) was 1,464,842."

ಹೀಗೆ 14 ಲಕ್ಷ 64 ಸಾವಿರ 842 ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಿರ್ಧರಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು—ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಪ್ರತ್ಯೇಕವಾದ ಮಿನಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಯನ್ನೇ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಹಾಗೆಯೇ ನಮ್ಮ ದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿಯ ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದೇ ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಆಗಿದೆ. ಎಂದರೆ ಈ ಪಂಚವಾರ್ಷಿಕ ಯೋಜನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಹ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬುದು ನನ್ನ ಸಲಹೆ.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಭೀಮಪ್ಪನಾಯಕ್ (ಮೊಳಕಾಲ್ಮುರು).— ಹಾಗಾದರೆ ಈ ಬಾಬಿಗೂ ಒಂದು ಮಿನಿಮಿಯಮ್ನು ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಮ್ಮ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವೇ? ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.— ಇನ್ನು ನಮ್ಮ ಕಾಲ ದಲ್ಲಿ ಇಂಥ ರೀತಿ ಕಲೆಕ್ಟ್ ಮಾಡಿರುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದರೆ:

“Information collected from 37 important towns in India show that out of a population of 1.7 million engaged in large-scale industries over 4 to 5 lakhs are without accommodation. The advance figures supplied by census authorities of 1951 show that the population of 74 cities in India increased by 74 lakhs in the decade 1941 to 1951 while the population of smaller towns increased by 140 lakhs during the same period. When it is realised that conditions of housing in 1941 in industrial towns were far from satisfactory, the gravity of the housing problem will be apparent.”

ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂಶಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಆರೋಚನೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಎಲ್ಲ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯ ಒತ್ತಡ ಜಾಸ್ತಿಯಾಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಅಂಥ ಕಡೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದನ್ನು ಹೆಚ್ಚಿಗೆ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನು ಅವರು ಗಮನದಲ್ಲಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಒಂದು ಏರ್ಪಾಡನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ನಮ್ಮ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈಗ ಈ ವಸತಿ ಗೃಹಗಳ ಅನುಕೂಲವನ್ನು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಮಧ್ಯಮ ತರಗತಿಯ ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಒದಗಿಸಬೇಕೆಂಬ ಉದ್ದೇಶದಿಂದ ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೂ ಕೂಡ ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನೊದಗಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ ಮತ್ತು ಒದಗಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸಿದ್ಧವಾಗಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅವರು ಮಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶಿಫಾರಸ್ಸುಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮೂರು ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ವಿಚಾರಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ.

“There should be certain minimum standard for housing for smaller towns as well as for large cities.”

ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ಸ್ಟ್ಯಾಂಡರ್ಡಿನಲ್ಲಿ ನಮ್ಮಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ತಯಾರಾಗತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಸಲಕರಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದ ದೃಷ್ಟಿಯಿಂದ ಆವಶ್ಯಕವಾದದ್ದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಲಾಗಿದೆ.

“Local authorities should be assisted in the clearance of slum areas and for acquisition of land for the construction of houses by giving them loans at a reasonable rate of interest ;”

ಇನ್ನು ಸ್ಥಳೀಯರಿಯಾಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ. ನಮ್ಮ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು 93 ಸ್ಥಳೀಯರಿಯಾಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸುಮಾರು

70 ಸಾವಿರಕ್ಕಿಂತಲೂ ಹೆಚ್ಚಾಗಿ ಜನರು ವಾಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸ್ಥಳವನ್ನು ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ತೆಗೆಸಿ ಹಾಕುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರೇಷ್ ನಂತ್ಯೆಯವರಿಗೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ದೃವ್ಯಾನುಕೂಲತೆ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಹೋಗಿ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಅಷ್ಟು ಪ್ರತಿಕ್ರಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆದಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕ ಬಗ್ಗೆ ಒಂದು ಬ್ರಸ್ಸ್ ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ಬೇರೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡುಮಾಡಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದು ಕೈಗೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿರುವ ಯೋಜನೆಗೆ 3 ಕೋಟಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದೆಂದು ಅಂದಾಜು ಇರುತ್ತದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಕೆಲಸವಿನ್ನೂ ಪ್ರಾರಂಭವೇ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಅನುಕೂಲ ಒದಗಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ಮಾತನಾಡಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರುಗಳ ಪೈಕಿ ಶ್ರೀ ಜೆ. ಮಹಮ್ಮದ್ ಇಮಾರದವರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಮನಿಯಪ್ಪನವರೂ ಸರ್ಕಾರ ಹಳ್ಳಿಗಾಡಿನ ಕಡೆ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರಕ್ಕೆ ಗಮನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅದೇ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಪ್ರಾಂಶಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಅವಕಾಶವನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

“Improvements in the standards of rural housing will have to be carried out largely with local materials and local labour with a modicum of technical assistance.”

ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯು ಕಾರ್ಯಗತವಾಗಬೇಕಾದರೆ ಕಾಲ ಸನ್ನಿಹಿತವಾಗಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ಆರೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಈಗ ಈ ಮೈಸೂರು ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಎಂಬ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. 1954 ನೆಯ ಇಸವಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧ ಪಟ್ಟಂಥ ಎಂದರೆ ಈಗಿನ ರೇಟೆಸ್ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸೇನಸ್ ರೆಕ್ಯುಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಈ ಸೇನಸ್ ಅಂಶ ಅಂಶಗಳ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಮಗೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮನೆಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗಿರುತ್ತವೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ತಿಳಿಯಪಡಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಇಂದಿನ ಒಟ್ಟು ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ ಸುಮಾರು 90 ಲಕ್ಷ ಚಿಲ್ಲರೆ. Occupied houses ಹತ್ತು ಲಕ್ಷದ 84 ಸಾವಿರದ 48 ಮನೆಗಳು. ಈ ಪೈಕಿ ರೂರಲ್ ಪಾರ್ಟ್ಸ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿರುವವು 1 ಮಿಲಿಯನ್ 277 ಸಾವಿರದ 104 ಮನೆಗಳು. ಆರ್ಟನ್ ಪ್ರದೇಶದಲ್ಲಿ 306 ಲಕ್ಷದ 944 ಸಾವಿರ ಮನೆಗಳು. ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಮಿಕರೇಷ್‌ನ ಜನಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 7 ಲಕ್ಷ 78 ಸಾವಿರದ 976. ಇಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮನೆಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 84 ಸಾವಿರದ 545. ಎಂದರೆ ಸುಮಾರು 9 ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೇ 10 ಜನರಿಗೆ ಒಂದು ವಾಸದ ಮನೆ ಇದೆಯೆಂದಾಯಿತು. 5 ಜನಗಳಿಗೊಂದು ಸಂಸಾರವೆಂದು ನಾವು ಭಾವಿಸುವುದಾದರೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರಿನಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅರ್ಧ ಸಂಸಾರಿಗಳಿಗೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ವಾಸದ ಮನೆಗಳೇ ಇಲ್ಲ.

ಇನ್ನು ಮೈಸೂರಿನ ಜನ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆಯನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ—ಅಲ್ಲಿ 2 ಲಕ್ಷ 44 ಸಾವಿರದ 323 ಜನರಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರದಲ್ಲಿ ಇರುವ ಮನೆಗಳ ಸಂಖ್ಯೆ 35,131. ಅಂದರೆ, ಅಲ್ಲಿಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಗೆ ಏಳೆಂಟು ಜನ ಆಗುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಈ ಪಟ್ಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಪ್ರತಿ ದಿಸ್ತ್ರಿಕ್ಟಿಗೂ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಬಹುದು.

ಈಗ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾದ ಉದ್ದೇಶ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ Objects and Reasons ನಲ್ಲಿ ಹೇಳಿರುವಹಾಗಿ:

“The Housing problem has become acute in the case of the

(ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.)

lower middle classes and other low income groups of the population in rural and urban areas and the solution of this problem is as urgent as that of the population employed in industries."

ಈಗಿನ ಮೈಸೂರು ರೇಬರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಕೈಗಾರಿಕೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವ ಕೆಲಸಗಾರರಿಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸುವ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆಯಿದೆಯೇ ಹೊರತು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಬಡಜನರಿಗೆ, ಕಡಮೆ ಆದಾಯ ಹೊಂದುತ್ತಿರತಕ್ಕ ಮಧ್ಯಮ ತರಗತಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೆ ಸಹಾಯಕವಾದ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯಾವುದೂ ಇಲ್ಲ. ಏನಿದ್ದರೂ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಹೌಸ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳ ಮುಖಾಂತರ ಅವರಿಗೂ ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿನ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ನಡೆದಿದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಇತ್ತ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ತಮ್ಮ ನೌಕರರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ loan ಕೊಟ್ಟು ಸಹಾಯ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇಷ್ಟುಮಾಡಿದರೂ, it has not even touched the fringe of the problem ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು. ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆಯ ಪರಿಹಾರ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮಾತ್ರವೂ ಆಗಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯನ್ನು ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಬೊಂಬಾಯಿ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನು ನೆರವೇರಿತು ಇದನ್ನು ತಂದಿರುವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಸಾಲಯಾನ 2 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳು ಖರ್ಚಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ತಿಳಿಸಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

ಈ ಮಧ್ಯೆ ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಮತ್ತು ಮೈಸೂರು ನಗರಗಳ ವಿಷಯವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡರೆ, ಇಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಯೂ ಸೇರಿ ಮೂರು ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿರುತ್ತವೆ. ಒಂದು ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯ ಹೌಸ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿ, ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟಂತೆ ಸಿಟಿ ಇಂಪ್ರೂವ್‌ಮೆಂಟ್ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್, ಮೂರನೆಯದು ಇದು. ಈ ಮೂರನೆಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆ ಗೃಹ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣದ ವಿಚಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ಗಳಿಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಅವುಗಳಿಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ವಜಾಮಾಡಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದಿದೆ. ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟುವ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಗೆ ಇರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ಒಂದಕ್ಕೊಂದಕ್ಕೆ overlap ಆಗಿರುವ ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡಲು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಸ್ವಲ್ಪಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ವಜಾಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆ.

SRI A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I may submit we are not taking away any powers of any Trust Board. I believe they are intact. We may contact them and ask them to bring up buildings.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಹಾಲಿ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಬರುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂಚೆಯಿದ್ದ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಲ್ ಕೌನ್ಸಿಲ್‌ನವರು ಕೆಲವು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿ ಹೈರ್ ಪರ್ಫಾರ್ಮೆನ್ಸ್ ನಿಶ್ಚಯಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿದ್ದರು. ಅದರಿಂದಲೂ ಈ ಸಮಸ್ಯೆ ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿ ಬಗೆಹರಿದಿರಲಿಲ್ಲ. ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬಂದ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿಯ ಸುತ್ತಮುತ್ತಲ

ಲ್ಲರತಕ್ಕ ಅನೇಕ ವ್ಯವಸಾಯದ ಜಮೀನುಗಳನ್ನು ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಂಡು, ಸುಮಾರು 75 ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳವರೆಗೂ ಖರ್ಚುಮಾಡಿ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಎಂಗಡಿಸುವ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಿದರು. ಆದರೆ, ಜನಗಳಿಗೆ ಆ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳತಕ್ಕ ಶಕ್ತಿಯಿಲ್ಲವೋ ಅಥವಾ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಸ್ಥಿತಿಯೇ ಆ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿದೆಯೋ—ಯಾವ ಕಾರಣದಿಂದಲೋ ಆ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಜನರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಶೋಷಣೆಯಿಂದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸೈಟುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೂಡ ಜನರು ಕೊಂಡುಕೊಳ್ಳಲಾರರು.

ಇಂಥ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಬರುವುದಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೂ, ಈಗಾಗಲೇ ವಿರೋಧ ಪಕ್ಷದ ನಾಯಕರು ಹೇಳಿದಹಾಗೆ, ಒಂದು ಸರಿಯಾದ ಸರೈ ನಡೆಸಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಮನೆಗಳು ಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತವೆಯೋ ಯಾವ ತರಗತಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಮನೆಗಳು, ಬೇಕು, ಒಟ್ಟು ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಾಗಬಹುದು ಎಂದು ಸರೈ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಈ ಕೆಲಸ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ನಡೆದಿತ್ತೇ ಹೊರತು, ಕೇವಲ ಆಕ್ಟ್‌ನಿಂದ ಆಕ್ಟಿನ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತೇವೆಂದು ಹೊರಟರೆ ಕೆಲಸ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಸರ್ವೆ ನಡೆಸಲು ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅವಕಾಶ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಡಬೇಕು. ಒಂದೊಂದು ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನಲ್ಲೂ, ಡಿಸ್ಟ್ರಿಕ್ಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲೂ ಹಾಗೂ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಊರಿನಲ್ಲೂ ಎಷ್ಟೆಷ್ಟು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಪ್ರತಿ ತರಗತಿಯ ಜನರಿಗೂ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ, ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಎಷ್ಟು ಖರ್ಚಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕಟ್ಟಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ಯೋಜನೆಮಾಡಿ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ಕೈಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕು. ಇಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೆ ಹಣ ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ವ್ಯಯವಾಗಿ ಸರಿಯಾದ ಪ್ರತಿಫಲ ದೊರೆಯದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಈ ಮನೋದೆಯ 36, 37, 38 ಮುಂತಾದ ಸೆಕ್ಷನ್‌ಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ನಮೂದಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅಧಿಕಾರವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿ ಮುಂತಾದುವುಗಳಿಗೆ ಸಂಬಂಧಪಟ್ಟ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಇನ್ನು ಪರ್ಯಾಯೋಚನೆಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ಸುಗಮವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು Non-official Board ಇದ್ದರೆ ಎಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸಾಧ್ಯವೋ ಅಷ್ಟುಮಟ್ಟಿಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಿಂದ ರಚಿತವಾದ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಲಾರದು. ಏಕೆಂದರೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್‌ನ್ನು ರಚಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಅದು ಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಕೆಲಸಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಎಂಜಿನಿಯರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸಬೇಕು. ಮತ್ತು ಇದನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲೂ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸ್ವಾತಂತ್ರ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ.

"Every appointment to posts carrying a maximum monthly salary exceeding rupees two hundred shall be made in consultation with the Mysore Public Service Commission"

ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದೆ. ಹೀಗೆ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಅಂಗವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದರೆ ಈಗ ಇತರ ಸರ್ಕಾರಿ ಇಲಾಖೆಗಳು ಯಾವ ರೀತಿ ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆಯೋ, ಎಷ್ಟು ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆಯೋ ಅಷ್ಟೇ ತ್ವರಿತವಾಗಿ ಇದೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುತ್ತದೆ ಅಷ್ಟೆ. ಜನರ ಅನುಕೂಲಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಅದು ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಇತರ ಕೆಲಸಗಳ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಇದೂ ಒಂದು ದೊಡ್ಡ

ಕೆಲಸ ಬೀಳುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿಕೊಂಡು ಈ ಬಿಲ್ಲಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಕೆಲವು ಕಲಮುಗಳನ್ನು ತೆಗೆದುಹಾಕಿ ಇದನ್ನು autonomous bodyಯಾಗಿ ಮಾಡಿದರೆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳು ಸುಸೂತ್ರವಾಗಿ ನಡೆಯುತ್ತವೆಂದು ನನ್ನ

2-30 P.M.

ಭಾವನೆ. ಮತ್ತು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ 9(3)ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹಳ ಅನ್ವಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಈ ರೀತಿ ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ:

“The Chairman may hold office in an honorary capacity or on payment of remuneration.”

ಇದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟವಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತುಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಮಸೂದೆಗಳನ್ನು ತರುವಾಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ವಿಷಯಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ಪಷ್ಟವಾದ ಅಭಿಪ್ರಾಯವನ್ನು ಹೊಂದಿ ತರಬೇಕು. ಈಗ ಹಾಗಿಲ್ಲದಿದ್ದರೂ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅನ್ವಷ್ಟತೆಯೂ ಇಲ್ಲದಂತೆ, ಆನೋರಿಯಾಗಿರಬೇಕೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಭಾವನೆ ಅಥವಾ ಸಂಬಳ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆ ಎಂಬುದನ್ನು ನಿರ್ದಿಷ್ಟ ಮಾಡಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆ ಅನ್ವಷ್ಟವಾಗಿರುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲ.

ಸಬ್ ಕ್ಲಾಜು (2)ರಲ್ಲಿ “Every member shall receive such allowances as may be prescribed” ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಸಾಮಾನ್ಯವಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಈ ಕೆಲಸವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಿದರೆ, ಅದಷ್ಟು ಮಿತವ್ಯಯದಲ್ಲಿ, ಅದಷ್ಟು ಬೇಗ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗಬೇಕಾದ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳು ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಆಗಬೇಕಾಗಿವೆ. ಮಸೂದೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದರಿಂದ ಇದನ್ನು ನಾನು ಹೆಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರಸ್ತಾಪ ಮಾಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ.

5ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ Clause 5ರಲ್ಲಿ:

“For the removal of doubt, it is hereby declared that the Mysore House Rent and Accommodation Control Act, 1951—(a) shall not apply to any house belonging to or vesting in the Board under or for the purposes of this Act or under or for the purposes of the Mysore Labour Housing Act, 1949.”

ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ Mysore House Rent and Accommodation Control Act ನ ವ್ಯಾಪ್ತಿಯಿರುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ. Hire-purchase system ಮೇಲೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿದರೆ ಕೆಲವು ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಡಬಹುದು. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಮನೆ ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಹತ್ತೊಂಟಿ ಕಾನೂನು ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಅನಾವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಉದಾಹರಣೆಗೆ, ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ಸಿಟಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಕೃಷ್ಣರಾಜೇಂದ್ರ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟ್ ಇದೆ. ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಅಂಗಡಿಗಳನ್ನು ಬಾಡಿಗೆಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ House Rent and Accommodation Control Act ಅನ್ವಯಿಸದೆ ಇದರಿಂದ ಅನೇಕ ಅನಾಹುತಗಳಾಗಿವೆ. ಎಷ್ಟು ಬಾಡಿಗೆ ಬರಬೇಕೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಬರುತ್ತಿಲ್ಲ. ಇದು ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ ಸದಸ್ಯರೊಂದಿಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿದ್ದ, ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಆ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಇದಕ್ಕೂ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸಿದರೆ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯದು. ಈ ವಿಷಯ

ವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಷಿಯವರು ಆರೋಪಿಸಿ ಮಾಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ನಾನು ಸಲಹೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇನ್ನು 6ನೆಯ ಪುಟದಲ್ಲಿ 6ನೆಯ ಕ್ಲಾಜಿನಲ್ಲಿ:

“The Board shall consist of the Chairman and six other members appointed by the State Government.”

ಎಂದಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಟ್ರಸ್ಟ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿಂದ ಕೆಲವರನ್ನು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸಬಹುದು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನು ಪ್ರಕಾರ ರಚನೆಯಾಗತಕ್ಕ ಮೆ ಸೂರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್ನಿಂದ ಪ್ರತಿನಿಧಿಗಳಿರಬೇಕು. ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ನವರು ಚುನಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಿ ಕಳುಹಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಹೀಗೆಯೇ ಮೈಸೂರು ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿ ಮತ್ತು ಬಾಕಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳಿಗೂ ಅವಕಾಶವಿರಬೇಕು. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಭಾಗಗಳಿಂದಲೂ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆಯೋ ಇಲ್ಲವೋ ಸಂದೇಹ. ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮಾಡಿ ದೊಡ್ಡ ದೊಡ್ಡ ಊರುಗಳಿಗೆ ಒಂದೊಂದು ‘ರೀಜನಲ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್’ಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಬಹುದೆಂದು ಕಾಣುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಮಾಡದೇ ಹೋದರೆ ಒಬ್ಬ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್ ಮತ್ತು ಆರು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರಿಂದ ಕೂಡಿದ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿ ಕೆಲಸ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ...

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I may clarify one point for the information of the House. For the whole of Bombay Presidency, there are only four members on the Board, because they deal with borrowed money.

ಶ್ರೀ ಪಿ. ಆರ್. ರಾಮಯ್ಯ.—ಅದರ ಇದು ಇಡೀ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಕ್ಕೇ ಅನ್ವಯಿಸುವುದರಿಂದ, ಆರು ಜನ ಸದಸ್ಯರೂ ಒಬ್ಬ ಚೇರ್ಮನ್‌ರೂ ಸೇರಿ ಕೆಲಸ ನಡೆಸುವುದರಿಂದ ಎಷ್ಟು ತೃಪ್ತಿಕರವಾಗಿ ಆಗಬಹುದೋ ಅಷ್ಟು ಆಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು.....

Mr. SPEAKER.—Bombay is a bigger State, and there are less number of persons on the Board.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—The whole of Bombay State, I said. If it is your opinion, I leave it to you.

Sri P. R. RAMAIA.—With due deference to the Minister, Sir, if the Mysore Housing Board Bill were to be modelled on the lines of the Bombay Bill, we have yet to know how the Bombay Board works, and whether the yield of the work is satisfactory or not. While considering this Bill it occurs to me that these seven men including the Chairman will not be able to tackle this problem in a satisfactory manner. That is my opinion. Of course, it is left to the Select Committee to consider the question further. On the

(SRI P. R. RAMAIA.)

whole, it is a measure which has a very good objective before it.

ಇದು ಬಹಳ ಒಳ್ಳೆಯ ಮನೂವೆ. ಕಾರ್ಯದಲ್ಲೂ ಯಾವರಿಗೂ ಇದನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರುತ್ತಾರೆಯಾದರೆ ಮೇಲೆ ಇದರ ಫಲವನ್ನು ನೋಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದಮೇಲೆ ಅವರು ಆಲೋಚನೆಮಾಡಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕವೆಂಬುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿ ಸೂಕ್ತ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡಬೇಕಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಆ ರೀತಿಯ ಬದಲಾವಣೆಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾಡಲೆಂದು ನೂಟಿಸಿ, ಈ ಮನೂವೆಗೆ ನನ್ನ ಬೆಂಬಲ ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇನೆ.

* Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR (T.-Narasipur).—Sir, Mr. Speaker, I wish to place before this House my observations on this Bill, styled as the Mysore Housing Board Bill, 1954. It has become very necessary to know how this problem of the house shortage is being met at present. Sir, as pointed out in the Statement of Objects and Reasons, so far as the Industrial Labour Housing is concerned, there was an Act called the Mysore Labour Housing Act and a Corporation constituted under the Act called the Labour Housing Corporation.

So far as the Labour housing is concerned, it was satisfactory. But so far as housing for the middle class people and the lower income groups are concerned, we have to-day a number of co-operative institutions working in various parts of the State. There was a co-operative seminar in Nanjangud in the year 1948 when this question of providing houses for the middle class people and the lower income groups was discussed. As a result of the discussion in the seminar, a decision was arrived at to incorporate an institution called the Mysore Provincial House Building Corporation. Government accepted the recommendation of the seminar and took steps to constitute a body like that. It was registered under the Mysore Co-operative Societies Act. For the last five years this Corporation is having an incorporated existence. Sir, in the Bye-laws of this Mysore Provincial House Building Corporation it is said that its activity is extended to the whole State of Mysore. Government have also taken up the responsibility of nominating its Chairman. And the

Board have already passed a period of 3 years from the date of its incorporation. At present the members of the Board are elected.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—Not so far. This is the first time.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—They will elect now after the termination of the period of three years. The various house building co-operative societies working in several parts of the State are members of this Corporation. When we have a set-up like this of a Board, I would like to know what reasons there were for the Government to introduce this Bill. Instead of trying to incorporate a new body called the Mysore Housing Board, why could they not have given their utmost assistance to the Provincial House Building Corporation itself and get these buildings constructed by them. In addition to the Corporation, the Trust Boards of the big cities of Mysore and Bangalore are doing useful work. Suppose we agree to this Bill. Then, we will be constituting a Board that will have duties and functions similar to the provincial institution already in existence. By agreeing to this Bill we will be incurring an additional liability to the extent of Rs. 2½ lakhs as administrative expenses, which the Government have undertaken to meet, according to the provisions of this Bill. If the Government had only thought of giving this Rs. 2½ lakhs as assistance to the various institutions, perhaps we could solve the problem much earlier. They could build so many houses in 2½ lakhs that they propose to spend on administrative expenses and they could solve the housing problem to some extent. So it is very necessary for us to know why the Government have thought fit to incorporate another body which will have its functions and duties almost similar to those of the several institutions already existing.

Then, Sir, everywhere, on platforms, we are urging for the formation of co-operative commonwealth. We say that we want to encourage co-operative institutions; we want Governments to run on co-operative lines. But how is it that the Government have thought fit

to bring into existence a purely nominated body which is answerable to none except the Government and which is purely at the mercy of the Government? The entire Board will be nominated by the Government. And even if the Chairman takes leave for a few days, the Government does not want members of the Board to elect their own Chairman for a temporary period. They have a provision for nominating the Chairman themselves. Clause 7 gives this power:

“The State Government may from time to time grant to the Chairman such leave as may be admissible under the rules and any person whom the State Government appoints to act for the Chairman during such absence on leave shall, while so acting, be deemed for all purposes of this Act to be the Chairman.”

Why I have drawn the attention of Government to this clause is this: suppose the Chairman is on leave. Members of the Board have not got the right to choose one among themselves to be the Chairman during the absence of the permanent Chairman. It only shows that the Government have retained all the powers for themselves. They want to have another institution which is on the mercy of the Government. The Government have a desire to have very wide powers, which I shall show presently. In these days, when we want to do everything on co-operative basis, to bring into line a purely nominated body is absolutely a retrograde step. It is a step that is against all co-operative principles. By this method, they are going to kill co-operative institutions in the State. I believe it is not the business of a democratic Government to undertake a scheme of this nature whereby they have indirectly helped to see that co-operative institutions do not thrive. On that ground I oppose this particular clause.

As regards clause 5, it gives exemption to the Board from the operation of the provisions of the House Rent Control and Accommodation Act. How selfish the Government is! At the same time in the same clause the Government

want this provision also: ‘but shall apply to any House let to the Board.’ Suppose a house is taken for rent by the Board, they want the application of the House Rent Control and Accommodation Act. But if they want to give the house on rent to a poor man, they do not want him to be subjected to the House Rent Control and Accommodation Act. Why should they get exemption? It is not in the State interest. You are creating business of huge magnitude: you are getting into the steps of a rich person who builds buildings and rents them out. You are doing this for the purpose of rent. Further, while the rich man runs the risk of collecting rent from the Government employees and the employees of local authorities, the Housing Board has added security. By provision of law you compel the local authority and the Government departments to collect rent due to the Board by deduction from their salaries. I will discuss about this provision subsequently. (*A Voice*: It is public money). Yes, everything is public money. Even the money that you and I have in our pockets is public money. Suppose we agree to this clause 5. The Board has exemption from the operation of the provision of the House Rent Control and Accommodation Act. If you read clause 50, you will be astonished. If a tenant is a defaulter for two months, the Board has a right to evict him straightaway. I will tell you how. If a tenant is a defaulter for two months, the Board has the power to give him notice served (i) by post, or (ii) by affixing a copy of it on the outer door or some other conspicuous part of such premises, or (iii) in such other manner as the Board deems fit. So, if the tenant is unfortunately not in the headquarters, or is on leave and does not return within six months, then he will find on his return that all his things have been thrown out of the house and the house vacated. The Board has full powers under clause 50 to evict him. Did you not think of these things? (*A Voice*: Within one month.) No, two months.

And then, the Board has power to evict him if necessary by using force,

(SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR)

The Board has the right to simply post a notice—they do not care whether the notice has been received by the tenant or not—or to paste it in front of the house over the wall or by any other manner that the Board deems fit. That is the provision. I have laid stress on that point just because I wanted to impress on this House that the Board is not fair so far as the tenant is concerned.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—That is Bombay Model !

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—In Bombay so many things happen. We do not get all the privileges of Bombay. We had so many such objections at the time of the Select Committee of the House on the House Rent and Accommodation Control Bill. In the Select Committee, Sir, Sri Anantaraman advocated the cause of tenants to such an extent to provide more restrictions on the landlord. The Housing Board as it would come into existence in accordance with this Bill, is nothing better than a landlord, than a moneyed man, than a capitalist. Well, Sir, when we have provided so much safeguard to the tenant under the House Rent and Accommodation Control Act, why should we not extend the same safety to the tenants of the Houses that are owned by the Housing Board ? What is the difficulty that the Government have experienced in providing such safeguards to the tenants ? On the other hand, they should all the more see that the House Rent and Accommodation Control Act is applicable to the Board too. Because they claim that this Board is constituted for the purpose of providing dwellings to the middle-class and lower income-groups. It is those classes of people that are in absolute need of safety. Therefore, it is very necessary that the Government should forego this exception that they want to claim.

Next, Sir, as regards the number of Members of the Board, it is proposed that the Board will consist of Chairman and six members, all nominated by the Government. Since the applicability of this Bill is extended to the whole State of Mysore, it would be

very necessary in such circumstances to have a representative from each District. I have just heard what the Hon'ble Minister said, that in Bombay for the whole State, the Housing Board has only four members. Bombay is a highly developed State. Mysore is yet to be developed so far as housing programme is concerned. The Board has to undertake several housing schemes in almost all the districts. The housing shortage is so acute that it would be very necessary that such schemes have to be undertaken in almost all the districts simultaneously and therefore it would be better if the Housing Board has as its members at least one for each District since it depends entirely on nomination. I think, Sir, that by such a method uniformity could be obtained and the problems prevailing in various parts of the State could be tackled effectively.

Coming to Section 8 which relates to disqualification for appointment on the Board, I find, in sub-section (3), a provision as follows :

“8(3) : A person shall not be disqualified under clause (d) or (e), sub-section (1) or be deemed to have any share of interest in any incorporated company which has any share or interest in any contract or employment with, by or on behalf of, the Board, by reason only of his being a shareholder of such company : ”

If I hold certain shares in a company and that company enters into agreement with the Board for the execution of such contract, I will not be disqualified from being appointed as a Member of the Board. If on the other hand, I am the Secretary or the Manager or have interest in the contract, I will be disqualified. My point is this. If I have a large number of shares in a commercial concern and that commercial concern has offered its tender for construction of buildings or something under the Board and if I am a member of the Board, I believe I can easily influence the Board to give a contract in the name of that company. Therefore there should be no exception. Even if he is a share-holder, he should

be disqualified. I know under the same clause, there is a provision which also reads as follows:

“Provided that such person disclose to the State Government the nature and extent of the shares held by him.”

That is not enough. It is not enough only to know it. Such people should not be on the Board, so that we may have fairplay and justice done so far as the activities of the Board are concerned.

In section 10 which relates to vacancy of a Member, I find in sub-section (c) provision as follows:

“(c): is absent without the permission of the Board from all the meetings of the Board for three successive meetings.”

I think it ought to be like this:

“three successive monthly meetings.”

Because the Board can summon special meetings at any time. According to the provision, if the Board summons four or five meetings during the course of the same month and if the member is absent from three successive meetings during that month, it means he becomes disqualified. I believe that it is not the object of the Government. It should be put at ‘three successive monthly meetings’ or ‘three successive ordinary meetings’. That will solve the difficulty.

SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—A provision similar to that in the Town Municipalities Act?

SRI S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Yes, similar to Town and City Municipalities Act.

Sir, in Clause 14 (6) there is a provision which reads as follows:

“The Board shall take over and employ such of the existing staff serving for the purpose of the Mysore Labour Housing Corporation and every person so taken over and employed shall be subject to the provisions of this Act as if he was appointed under this Act.”

I feel, Sir, all the staff that is now employed under the Labour Housing

Corporation should be taken over *in toto*. There should be no discrimination. All those that are in the service of the Labour Housing Corporation should be absorbed and taken over after the passing of this Housing Board Bill. That is my point.

Section 20 provides for the execution of contracts. The powers that the Board will have under this section are huge. I will just read what it says:

“Every contract shall be made on behalf of the Board by the Chairman, provided that no contract involving an expenditure of rupees five lakhs and more shall be made without the previous sanction of the State Government.”

That means, up to five lakhs, the Board can enter into contract. Even the Chief Engineer has not so much powers. I believe the Chief Engineer of Mysore has only powers to accept tenders and approve estimates only up to a limit of Rs. 50,000; and beyond that it goes to the Government. Now investing this Board with powers up to the extent of five lakhs, seems to be rather dangerous. Therefore, I believe, they should reconsider this section.

And in sub-section (ii) of section (b) it is said that:

“No estimate or tender involving an expenditure of Rupees 25,000 and more shall, subject to clause (a), be sanctioned or accepted without the previous sanction of the Board.”

3 P.M.

Sir, when once an estimate is sanctioned by the Board, why should the tender be once again sanctioned by the Board? When an estimate costing more than Rs. 25,000 is sanctioned by the Board, why should not the Chair be authorised to accept the tender or finalise the tender without exceeding Rs. 25,000 or works that have been sanctioned by the Board? By having this provision matters will be delayed, because the Board meets once in two months, and if a subject has to be brought before the Board, it will be four months. When the Board sanctions an estimate and tenders are called

(Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)

for and the tenders are to be accepted by the Board, according to this Bill, it would be another two months. Therefore, there would be so much of delay and consequent loss.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—The Board can delegate such powers.

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—I know; section 21 says it. Sir, under Section 25, the Board have to submit to Government the housing programme for the coming year. But, nothing is provided here for the Board to consult the Local Bodies concerned before submitting such a programme! The activities of the Board extend to the whole State of Mysore. Nothing prevents the Board in undertaking a scheme in a place which is within the limits of a town municipality or city municipality or the Corporation. When they prepare a housing scheme and submit it to the Government, why should they not consult the Local Authorities? Nothing is provided under Section 25 compelling the Housing Board to consult the Local Authorities. On the other hand, there is every safeguard to the Board under Section 31 where it is said that after sanction by Government under Section 27, the Board can intimate this fact to the Local Authorities by a notice. How unjust it is! You know the Local Authority is an elected Body; it is a Statutory Body. It has come into existence under statute. When any housing scheme that the Board proposed to undertake lies within the area, within the jurisdiction of any statutorily constituted local authority, why should not the Board consult the local authority before submitting their programme for the sanction of Government? Suppose, granting that there is no provision under Section 25, why should not the Government, under Section 26, provide a provision for consulting the local authorities? Section 26 says that the Government can sanction such building programmes. Why should not Government provide under this section to consult the local authorities in such cases? If they do so, it will not only

assist the local bodies concerned to co-operate with the Housing Board but it will also settle so many problems. There are so many problems that are common between the Housing Board and the local authorities. It would be . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—What time do you require?

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—About half an hour. The Bill has 79 sections and in every section we have the difficulty of clash between the local bodies and the Board.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The House will now rise for lunch and meet at 3-30.

The House rose for Lunch at Three Minutes past Three of the Clock and reassembled at Thirty Minutes past Three of the Clock.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER in the Chair]

Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.—Sir, I was just speaking about the cordial relationship between the Board that is proposed to be incorporated under this Bill and the local bodies in the State. Cordial relationship should exist between these two institutions because after the completion of the housing scheme, the streets and other things that would be laid by the Board have to be maintained by the local bodies. According to Section 35, it is said:

“ . . . and shall thenceforth be maintained, kept in repair, lighted and cleaned by the Corporation, Municipal Council, District Board or Village Panchayet.”

Therefore, Sir, it would be necessary to make a provision here to see that the consultation with the local body is obligatory. Sir, in addition to this, out of the funds of the Board certain contribution should be paid to the local body for the maintenance work and for payment of the lighting bill. Once the housing scheme is complete, the Board leaves the place and it is the local boards that have to attend to the rest. Therefore, it is very

necessary that some share of the profits of the Board is given to the local bodies for extra work that they will undertake.

The betterment charge that has been provided under this Bill can never help the middle class men or the lower group. The betterment charge, as proposed in this Bill, is too heavy. I will just read what is provided for betterment charge:

“Section 40. When by the making of a housing scheme any land in the area comprised in the scheme will in the opinion of the Board be increased in value, the Board in framing the scheme may declare that betterment charges shall be payable by the owner of the land or any person having an interest therein in respect of the increase in value of the land from the execution of the scheme.

“(2) Such increase in value shall be the amount by which the value of the land on the completion of the execution of the scheme estimated as if the land were clear of the buildings exceeds the value of the land prior to the execution of the scheme estimated in like manner and the betterment charges shall be one-half of such increase in value.”

I will just illustrate how this will affect. Suppose there was a dry land valued at Rs. 200 an acre. After the completion of this scheme, the Board considers that the value has gone up to Rs. 2,000. The difference between the two is Rs. 1,800 and half of that would be Rs. 900 and the owner of the land will be required to pay this excess amount to the land. That would be too heavy and no provision has been made for the payment of the betterment charges in instalments either. Further provision in this Bill says that if a person enters into an agreement with the Board for a definite period, he has to pay interest in perpetuity. There is no provision here enabling the owner of the land to pay this betterment charge at least in instalment. It is a thing that has to be gone into.

Apart from this, if there is an adjoining land, even in such a case the owner of the adjoining land should pay a betterment charge for nothing at all. I feel that it is a very heavy burden and it ought not to be inflicted on the owners of the adjoining area.

Sir, this Board is answerable to the Government alone. Though this House has the power to discuss the budget of the State and yet the Board's activity is not subject to the control of this House. When the Cabinet is answerable to this House, I do not see why the activity of the Board has not been subjected to the control of this House. They are satisfied to place the report of the Board on the table of this House. It does not mean that we can raise a discussion on that, it does not mean that the Board is subordinate to this House. It is very necessary that the Board should be subordinate to this House. Why I have insisted on this section is, because of the existing sub-section to cl. 78, if the Board has to be dissolved, it should be done by the Resolution of this House. When this House has the power of dissolving the Board, why not the accounts of the Board subjected to the vote of this House? Therefore, it is very necessary that the report on the working of the Board should be discussed by this House.

Sir, as I have already taken a good lot of time of this House and as some of my friends are feeling that I should cut short my observations, I believe I can wind it up in a few words. I would like to summarise as follows: First, I am against the incorporation of a nominated body. It should be a Board elected from this House; secondly, as regards membership, there must be at least 10; thirdly, the incorporation of this Board itself is unnecessary with the present set up and that the Government should take steps to improve the various institutions that are already working and develop them and give them all possible financial assistance rather than create a new Board and that too purely a nominated Board. The powers that are sought to be given to the Board are very heavy. The position of the tenants will be highly

(Sri S. SRINIVASA IYENGAR.)
oppressive and it has not provided for a good treatment of the tenants. I believe, Sir, that the Select Committee would go into every question and see that all these defects are remedied and a proper Bill is placed before this House.

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS (St. John's Hill).—Mr. Speaker, Sir, after this country gained independence, three fundamental problems faced this country. One was the problem of food; second was the problem of clothing and the third was the problem of shelter. Thank God, the problem of clothing is already solved; not only have we reached self-sufficiency in clothing but we also now produce more than what we need. Similarly, we just had last week the assurance from the Food Minister of the Central Government that the country was gradually going towards the goal of self-sufficiency and we might, in the near future, see that this country's problem on the fundamental question of food was properly solved. But I should say that in regard to the problem of shelter, the country has done very little or nothing. I referred to this a couple of years ago in my Budget speech and now the Government has realised the difficulty and brought forward this Bill. It makes me happy and for that simple reason at least, I welcome this Bill. Many have been the comments that have been made, particularly by the members of the Opposition about the need for a Bill of this kind. My friend Mr. Imam unfortunately, I think, did not read the first paragraph in the Statement of Objects and Reasons. This Board is perhaps a modified form of the Board of the Labour Housing Corporation. The Labour Housing Corporation had its limitations. It was meant only for labour housing and that Corporation normally could not undertake any other kind of housing. When the Government found that under the Five-Year Plan another Board was necessary, it naturally thought that the best thing would be to scrap the previous Board and to incorporate a new Board calling it the Mysore Housing Board. I think it is perfectly

in order and without it the Government of Mysore would not have received any money from the Central Government for housing other than industrial housing. It has been pointed by many and perhaps justly too that there are very many agencies in the State which have been doing or at least attempting to do the works contemplated by the Board. In the cities of Bangalore and Mysore, we have City Improvement Trust Boards. In some of the leading municipalities, the Act permits them, though they do not attempt house-building or similar activities. The question naturally arises: what is the need for a Board of this kind when agencies already exist? No doubt it is a very moot question that I cannot perhaps satisfactorily answer. I personally think that it is the idea of the Government that it is wise to have a central agency in the form of a small Board which will in turn keep a kind of supervision or a kind of control over the districts or other agencies that may be created in future. I for one will not envisage a Board of seven members trying to have housing schemes all over the State. In my opinion, it is almost impossible and if they attempt anything of the kind, I can safely say that it will be a perfect failure. Do you think that the Government could become a house-building agency all over the State? Specially with moneys which it cannot command and with probably borrowed money at 4 per cent, if house-building is to be attempted by Government, what is the benefit accruing to the Government? Everyone of us knows that by building houses and letting them out, one hardly gets a return of 2 to 3 per cent on the capital. If that is the case, the Government cannot become a house-building agency. It may encourage and stimulate house-building in the various parts of the country; wherever there are co-operative institutions, wherever there are municipalities, wherever there are local bodies willing to take up this work, this Central Board can give them all the necessary help both in the form of money and technical advice. It is only if the

scheme could be worked on these lines that I hope this Board will do something worth mentioning. Otherwise, if it thinks or if the Government thinks that every kind of housing activity in the State is going to be the predominant privilege of this Board, I will categorically say that it is not going to be a success.

Now, the second point to be considered is, it is unfortunately not mentioned in the Bill as to where does this Board get the finance from. Of course, now the Government of India is giving loans as also a certain amount of subsidy. But for the whole State of Mysore a few lakhs a year will perhaps be a drop in the ocean. The Government have not told us where more money is to be got from. Is it to be in the form of loan, or is it to be collected from the local bodies or is it that you contemplate other lay-outs or houses for various parts of the State and sell these properties in turn for those who want it and thus recoup the money that you have lost? As members are aware, the Improvement Trust Boards receive money from the Government, make lay-outs and sell the lands to the people that want it, thus realising the money they spent on the lay-outs. Unless the Government think of a scheme on those lines, certainly this Board cannot get the necessary finance.

Sri P. R. RAMAIIYA.—Where are the lands?

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS.—In a country like Mysore, I can tell you definitely, particularly in rural areas there is plenty of land. Comments have also been made on the composition of the Board. Somebody suggested that district representation should be given. Well, Sir, I do not think that a Housing Board should be made on a district basis. The Housing Board, I would even say, should be smaller, should consist of men of highest integrity and character, men technically qualified and men who could give their best to the State. It does not depend upon whether he lives in the Shimoga District or in the Tumkur District. It has nothing to do with the district in which he lives. This Board has power all over the State. I am against giving

district representation to this Board. I simply say: select men wherever they may be, so long as they do the State good service.

Sri T. N. MUDALAGIRI GOWDA (Kunigal).—Why, Sir, did you mention only Tumkur and Shimoga?

Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS.—I shall be happy if men are selected from other districts also provided there are men of the kind that I want. I shall congratulate Sri Mudalagiri Gowda if his district contributes one. I personally do not feel that the district should come into consideration of the Government at all when this Board is constituted. What we want is men who selflessly work for the State, whose only object is to see that housing in the State gets a fillip and to see year by year houses coming up all over the State, particularly for the lower income groups.

I cannot perhaps close this without one single reference to the levy that has been made by the Government on industries. If at all during the last one or two years the Government of Mysore have attempted to build a few houses in industrial cities like Davangere and Bhadravati and other places, it is out of the money they have collected from the industrialists in the State. They started collecting at the rate of 3 per cent on the monthly wage of the concern. After the Government of India have made it an all-India scheme they stopped the collection, but in this Bill again a 4 per cent collection does not seem all right. As I understand, the industries have sent representations to the Government protesting against this levy because they feel that under to-day's conditions when trade is not very brisk and when conditions are not very happy, this levy of 4 per cent would be a very heavy burden on them. Of course, in the case of old industries, they might perhaps bear the burden but I would appeal to the Government that in the case of industries started just after the war the Government may be pleased to defer the question of this levy—at least in respect of those industries which have had less than 10 years lease of life. Income-tax rebates have been granted by the Centre to these

(Sri V. M. MASCARENHAS.)
new industries. That being the case, I would suggest that these new industries for the first 15 years, be exempt from this levy.

The work that the Government have undertaken, I must admit, is stupendous; providing housing for every poor man is a thing which not only needs great attention but also great care. It is not a joke. The City Improvement Trust Board in seven years could not with all the facilities at their command make a lay-out for more than 4,000 sites, not buildings but only sites; if that is the poor progress made by them with all the facilities that they have, I just envisage what the Housing Board is going to do all over the State. I feel that with the limited resources at their disposal, the Board cannot do much unless and until every district, every local agency feels it their duty to give the Board all the help that they can. The Government must take care to see that, if they really mean that the houses for the poor come up, they put up a very strong man as Chairman of the Board and give every encouragement to him and a well thought out programme which must be fulfilled at any cost during each year.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN (Kolar).—Mr. Speaker, I would like to offer some remarks on this very important Bill. No doubt I share the enthusiasm of every Hon'ble Member of the House including the Hon'ble Minister in charge over this Bill and that he has thought of a scheme much to be valued and highly to be praised and generally to be welcomed, considering the stupendous task that is going to be undertaken by the Government in consequence of this Bill, is also good. But still if I should think of making some remarks, possibly as a sceptic in these matters, it is not so much because I do not share the enthusiasm, accept the general and very wholesome principles of this Bill, but because I feel in working out this Bill I envisage a great deal of difficulty and it is that that makes me almost shudder at the very great task that is going to be undertaken by the Government. First and foremost, it

happens that I am in general agreement with Sri Mascarenhas who has just preceded me and his fears are also mine.

I shall preface these remarks with one or two general observations. One difficulty that stares me in my face is, here is an attempt made to take up this important task—to use the language of the Five-Year Plan—from the private sector to the State sector. I want the Government to explain to this House and to my humble self whether they really understand the consequences of such a great step as that. Let us consider the problem. As a background against this Bill, what is the position as it obtains in the country to-day? In fact, you have already got one scheme whereby an attempt has been made to give housing facilities to the industrial labour. In regard to the financial aspect of that, there is also a definite programme before us. There is the compulsory levy from the industrial management to the extent of 25 per cent; there is the levy of 25 per cent from the employee himself and there is the contribution from the State. Like that, the entire fund that is necessary in order to provide for housing facilities under industrial labour, as far as the financial implications thereof were concerned, they are fairly safeguarded and the responsibility as a result of it, thrown upon the State Government, is practically one-fourth, if not a little more. Here you have got a new Bill—I am just considering the financial implications of this Bill. The contribution from the General State Fund or the Centre is not going to be envisaged within this Bill and the financial responsibility will be almost entirely of the State, and, I ask the Government, if you are going to stand by this Bill and implement it in the spirit in which it is brought forward and in the way in which the ordinary man in the country is going to understand, and if you are really going to give satisfaction to him. Considering the wideness, the variety with which the programme is going to be worked out tomorrow, if it is within your financial competence, no one would be more happy than myself to congratulate

the Government upon it. We know the resources of the State, how slender they are, how limited they are. You could consider only such programmes and such problems as were within your financial competence, but here is a very ambitious programme. If it is put through, I shall be happy. Can you do it? You have given up that idea of the old scheme; the compulsory levy and the Central levy are not going to be brought within this Bill. This whole scheme will be launched on the entire resources, on the slender resources of the State.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I want to clarify only one position, that is, about the levy that has been provided under the Labour Housing Corporation. The collection has been suspended under the advice of the Government of India. The Bill is there and we are not repealing that part of it. Therefore, the House may take it that the levy portion of 4 per cent still stands.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—I have not made myself very clear to the House, particularly to the Hon'ble Minister. What I was suggesting is, even as it is, in order to provide housing facilities for industrial labour you have had all the advantages; the Central assistance was there; the compulsory levy was there. These were available to you; yet you could not do much.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—One other thing. Under Clause 55, the Board shall have its own fund; the Board may accept subventions, donations and gifts from the Central Government or the State Government or a local authority or any individual or body, whether incorporated or not, for all or any of the purposes of this Act. So regarding subsidy it has been provided. Again under Clause 59, the Board may borrow any sum required and issue debentures. Therefore, that constitutes the Fund.

4 P.M.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—Sir, if your hopes come true, nobody would be sorry for that, I will congratulate you. Considering the stupendousness

of the problem of providing housing facilities for the industrial labour, you know how far finances will flow from Delhi to Mysore. When you are not capable of providing houses for the industrial labour even with only half the cost being subsidised by the Government, is it possible for you to take the entire responsibility of providing housing for all including the industrial labour? Don't you think you are undertaking greater responsibilities under this Bill? I ask, is it within your competence? Can you do it at all?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—I would request the Hon'ble Member to give practical suggestions, if possible.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—If the thesis that I am trying to develop, if that appeals to the Hon'ble Minister, then I go a step further and ask: can you do that? I will come to the solution. Look at this problem from another point of view. In fact, for these two days, the trend of discussion in this House from the several Hon'ble Members has been this. I am sure it will not be ignored. The fundamental objection against this Bill is: here is an attempt made for the first time, this seems to be an occasion where it is a case of making inroads on the non-official public life of Mysore. Whenever a question comes up, it is stated: 'This Government is informed like this'. Have you tried to know what is happening in the country? You have Local Self-Government Institutions throughout the State. You have got Town Municipalities; you have got Village Panchayets, and you have got the Corporation. All of them have got advisory functions, which they have to discharge. The functions of the local bodies will have to be guided, supervised and performed by non-official public men in the State. Here by this new Body with a nominated Chairman and six members, altogether with seven members, what is it that you hope to do? Such functions as would be discharged by the new Body under this Bill were already being done by them without this Bill being enacted into law. There is also a statutory body with statutory functions. Then where is the need for this duplication and what is it meant for?

(Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN).

Can it be said, is it your case that the local bodies in Mysore, the town municipalities, the city municipalities, the village panchayets and the Corporation, are not discharging the discretionary powers or the statutory powers properly? I am sure, in the constitution of these bodies, you cannot suggest any particular impediment such as to prevent them from discharging these functions. The law is clear. All these functions would have been very successfully executed by these bodies. If their hands are still stayed, only one reason appears to be responsible and that is finance. On the rock of finance, all these schemes are being foundered. I am sure it is not due to the unwillingness on the part of the local bodies that these discretionary powers, these statutory responsibilities were not being discharged. If you want to see that they exercise their functions sufficient financial help will have to be given to those autonomous bodies. Is there any other reason? Sri Srinivasa Iyengar in his own inimitable style has shown and quoted illustrations as to how there is going to be perpetual conflict between one body and another. I would be happy if the Hon'ble the Law Minister in the course of his reply would convince us that taking these two into consideration, i.e., the City Municipalities Act of 1933, the Corporation Act and the Village Panchayets Act and the Municipalities Act on the one hand and the law that is going to be enacted by this Bill on the other hand, which are similar, that there will not be overlapping of powers and overlapping of functions. I ask you: what is the wisdom, what is the justification that you have, to bring into being these two bodies, where the statutory powers are similar and the functions of both are similar? Unless you convince us that you are not superseding those bodies, that you are not taking away the powers vested in the town municipalities, the city municipalities, and the village panchayets and that still you want those very functions to be discharged also by a new body which you want to bring into existence, we cannot

support you. Will there not be conflict? I personally feel—of course, I am open to correction—in spite of the fact that these statutory bodies will co-exist in Mysore, each deriving authority by legislation sanctioned either by this law or by law already passed by this House, an awkward position arises. How is it going to be reconciled?

You have made one provision. I do not mean to say that you have done it by design. If it has been done by accident, I am sorry. You have stated in the course of the Bill that, when there is a conflict between the two bodies, an appeal shall lie to the Government and its decision shall be final. There is a catch here. I know it is not a happy term. But that is the only term which can appropriately bring out what I wish to state. There is a catch in the suggestion that when there is a conflict between two statutory bodies Government's decision will have to be accepted as final. How far are you going to reconcile this conflict? I am afraid that you are taking away in one breath the rights and privileges that have been conferred on the public life of the country by several Local Self-Government laws. Under the City Municipalities Act, there are certain statutory powers which only that body can exercise. Even Government cannot interfere in those powers. I ask for a clear and categorical statement on this matter. If even in small matters, the privileges and powers which the Local Self-Government institutions enjoy by law are going to be taken away by a Bill which Government wants to pass as law, I cannot enthuse over that function of Government. When the general discussions were going on for these two days on this Bill, the general considerations of the Bill were simply tormenting my mind. That I want to place before the Government. Even the history of the Local Self-Government legislations since this Government took charge is already very interesting. I do not want to draw upon it. If, really, you go to the extent of saying that you have got a stupendous programme to work out and that the law as it obtains today is not

sufficient and not satisfactory, if that is the argument, I am prepared to consider it.

You know very well the National Housing Scheme of England. It is something unique in the history of effort at social amelioration the world over. But you have not done any such thing. You are going to make this Board nothing but a landlord. Because, proprietary rights are not going to be conferred on those people. You say: "We are going to give housing facilities." For what? For merely habitation purposes and on rent. That is only very limited. The scope of this Bill is limited. The feeling that you are going to do something is good. But so long as you are in the position of landlord, what does it matter whether that landlord is the Bangalore City Corporation or the Kolar Town Municipality or a Village Panchayet of a particular place. The Housing Board is controlled by the Government. That there is anything very deep in this Bill, I cannot say. You have not fixed any target period, say ten years or 12 years or 14 years for providing dwelling accommodation for the poor men who cannot have the wherewithal to build houses for themselves to lay their heads at rest in the night. If you are going to build houses for all the poor men, if that is to be the haven that you are going to give for the poor people, I will be certainly jubilant; I will simply rejoice, even at the prospect of having a number of houses, thousands and thousands of houses strewn and scattered all over the entire State in order to give housing facilities. But that is not the scope of the Bill. After all you are going to be another landlord. Does it really mean that that landlordism which you want to assume could not be satisfactorily discharged by this municipal body, by this Corporation itself? We have got to consider whether you have realised the magnitude of the task. I ask that. It is beyond your financial resources. If over and above that you think of a contingency, which cannot be avoided, which will be satisfactorily met as a result of the law now obtaining, we are prepared to come to your help and let us have this

legislation. But it is not so. Therefore, this third important suggestion I would try to make to the Hon'ble the Law Minister. I ask him in all humility to please convince us that this is going to bring heaven in to Mysore. If that is going to result in bliss in the hearts of all the poor people, it is all right, because the idea that you have got here is very nice; in the Statement of Objects and Reasons you have said:

"with a view to providing for the welfare of the Industrial Labour by making provision for housing accommodation and for other connected purposes, the Mysore Labour Housing Act, 1949, was enacted and it has been in force for some time. The housing problem has become acute in the case of the lower middle classes and other low income groups of the population in rural and urban areas and the solution of the problem is as urgent as that of the population employed in industries."

But may I ask, what is meant by lower income groups? Is it really going to be suggested seriously that you want to provide houses for all lower income groups? It may be very good or easy to say so. But can I believe it? In the lower income groups in the State there are thousands and thousands, tens of thousands. Let us remember that. Unless this applies to lower income groups in rural parts and an earnest consideration is given to it by the Government in that direction, and a beginning is made, 90 per cent of the rural population will not be satisfied by your merely using such words as are found in the Statement of Objects and Reasons and those words will not carry any conviction. If conviction is to be carried, they must have the houses actually built. But have you really understood the concrete nature of the problem, the nature of the work that you wish to undertake when you suggest that you want to build houses for all the lower income groups in the several villages of the State? It is a question involving crores and crores of rupees, not tens of thousands. Of course, there is nothing wrong in stating to

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

ourselves, if not to the outside world, what our own limitations are in these matters. It may be very nice to put it on paper. Several provisions may be very nice. It is no doubt an ambitious programme. But when you come to brass tacks and interpret it in the terms of actually conferring the benefits upon the poor and the needy in the villages, to the thousands and tens of thousands of people, I may ask you,—I will not use a stronger word, I have the greatest respect, I know the intention behind this Bill, I know the Hon'ble Minister for Law has a very good intention and he has a sympathetic heart and that is why he has brought forward this Bill,—can you really translate into concrete shape and in a convincing manner that you are going to give houses to thousands and thousands of poor people in the villages? On the other hand, if in effect what you have thought of is only to give some more houses in cities and towns, notwithstanding the high-sounding phrases that have been used, the several provisions that have been incorporated in this Bill and the intentions declared in this Bill, then it is not sufficient. Nevertheless, the fact remains that you could not have gone farther. If you seriously mind to undertake this stupendous task, consider the variety of the tasks involved and the crores and crores of rupees involved. Let us not beguile ourselves into the belief that by merely introducing a legislation of this kind, we will be doing a great thing. Do you know of the Beveridge Plan of England? When the Labour Government came to power, they adopted the Beveridge Plan. This was hailed enthusiastically throughout the length and breadth of the world. But you are not giving a Beveridge Plan for Mysore. If you do, I will be very happy. I would congratulate the party in power of which you are the chosen representatives. Therefore, in regard to social activities and measures, I agree with Sri V. M. Mascarenhas; since the advent of freedom, since the country became free, the one question that is engaging the attention of everybody

is, how to ensure the greatest good of the greatest number. But, in fact, here the slogan must be, not the greatest good of the greatest number but the good of all. That is the slogan of our ministry. The utilitarian slogan has been given a go-by today and we want democracy, the good of all. If that is what you are going to do, I am afraid it is beyond your capacity. I am not going to worry you further, except making this suggestion. Have a clear understanding of what financial implications of the proposals are. That is my suggestion. About the financial memorandum, the less said about it the better. There is absolutely no indication whatever as to what it would cost. It is after all a short paragraph. I shall merely point out, by reading the financial memorandum, that this is certainly not helpful. The memorandum reads—

“Sub-clause (3) of clause 55 of the Bill provides that the State Government shall every year make a grant to the Mysore Housing Board, of a sum equivalent to the administrative expenses of the Board.”

I ask the Government, the Minister for Law: please look at clause 55. What does that say? It says—

“(1) The Board shall have its own fund.

“(2) The Board may accept grants, subventions, donations and gifts from the Central Government or State Government or a local authority or any individual or body, whether incorporated or not, for all or any of the purposes of this Act.”

We have merely to scan through the several expressions used in clause 55 to understand how far the possibilities are really envisaged in it. One possibility is getting Central assistance. Well, I have already referred to it when I began my remarks. The next important thing is grants, subventions, donations or gifts from the Central Government or State Government. I ask the Hon'ble the Law Minister to tell us, considering the

present financial position of the Government, considering the deficit of 3,33,00,000, what is the subvention or grant or donation that you can make from your own Budget? As a matter of fact, in the Budget of 1954-55, no provision has been made against this item at all. Even supposing the Government wants to make a provision at any stage, I ask the Hon'ble Minister, what is the limit to which you can go? Are you in a position at least to give a crore or two from the State Budget? In fact we have got programmes in the Municipalities. Government have given loans for works connected with drainage out of the loan that they have drawn from the Reserve Bank. If the Government is really serious, I would like to know from the Hon'ble Minister in the course of his reply whether the Government are in a position to make a donation or grant of a crore or two crores from the funds of the State in order to start the coffers of this Board that is contemplated under clause 55. I am afraid, you are not in a position to give any money at all. This clause also contemplates diverting funds from the local bodies. I ask, where is the need. In fact there seems to be a tendency—it appears to me, Sir, if I should harp upon that idea—of centralisation in contra-distinction to decentralisation. Today the funds of the local bodies are strewn about regardless of the local needs. The municipalities have to undertake works connected with drainage and water supply in order to meet the local needs. In fact every municipality will think of providing housing facilities for their sweeping staff—a sweepers' colony. That is a local need. The municipality may think of providing houses for their employees. These are all within the competence of the local bodies which they can undertake from out of their own resources and if necessary backed by the State. Now you want to centralise the whole thing. Is it really your case that the local bodies are not able to cope up with this work? Let us look at the municipalities. What is the financial position of these municipalities? These municipalities are able to meet the

normal needs of the people from their normal sources of revenue. If they are asked to take up such big works, they cannot get the money required to invest in those schemes. That is the position. Therefore it cannot be said that there are any surplus funds in the municipalities. Therefore, Sir, as you are aware, the position is that unless large sums of money come into the coffers of this agency, this scheme cannot work absolutely. And particularly when they talk about the low income-groups and the poorer sections, there is no question of asking them to make a compulsory levy. Therefore I have to ask the Government to reconcile their sympathy for the poorer people with their ability. Looking at clause 55, I get the impression that ultimately it comes to this, it dwindles down to this: if the Government is in a position to give large grants to fill the coffers of this Board and start it, then the scheme works. Otherwise it will not.

We can go a step further and say that this Bill requires some modifications even otherwise. I will only give two examples to say how it requires modification. I do not propose to take much time of this Hon'ble House. I will only dwell upon two provisions of this Bill just to show that it requires a lot of modification. One is: the Hon'ble Minister in the course of his speech referred to the betterment levy. That has been referred to by my Hon'ble friend Sri A. Bheemappa Naik, and several other safeguards. One illustration I would like to give is: You say, as a result of your housing scheme that you have undertaken, the land adjacent to that housing scheme area gets appreciated in value; and therefore you can compulsorily levy some tax on the owner of the land adjacent to your area of activity. I ask the Law Minister whether there is any foundation in law for such a compulsory levy. I do not know whether I have made that aspect clear myself or it needs to be clarified by the Law Minister. So far as I am concerned, there may be no sanction in law. By passing a legislation of this kind, suppose you think of a housing scheme round about a particular area and there

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

is an area which is not directly concerned with that scheme; but you go and say that, "as a result of the housing scheme that has been undertaken, the land value has appreciated and to the extent to which it has appreciated indirectly by virtue of the scheme the area must be subjected to a levy called the betterment levy; and what is more, you must pay that betterment levy within two or three months." Either the person concerned must come to an agreement with you, get terms from you for the payment of the said amount, or the Government will have its own methods of recovering the amounts due to them. Now I ask, how is it correct, even if there is foundation in law, because, as I said, I am rather sceptical in these matters and I wish that this scepticism be removed by the Hon'ble the Law Minister and I shall certainly withdraw my objection to that extent. But nevertheless, this objection is going to be there and how can you compel the man? When you formulated the housing scheme and undertook the work, the adjacent land owners were not consulted. They have not come into the picture. They are nowhere in the picture and not consulted, nor even informed. All of a sudden you descend upon him and say: look here, as a result of the work that I have undertaken, your land value has appreciated and therefore, you have to pay for it. I do not know if you can make a compulsory levy like that. What is more, I feel, Sir, constitutionally also, this may not be a correct or safe position. I will not use the word 'correct'; I will satisfy myself by using the word 'safe position'.

There is another thing which also appears to me to be very interesting and that is with reference to sections 77 and 78. I should rather think that the Hon'ble the Law Minister has most unceremoniously let down the child that he has got to father when he says that by a resolution of this Assembly, the Board automatically ceases to exist. That is what you have stated, Sir, in clause 78:

"78. The State Government may by notification in the *Mysore Gazette*, declare that with effect from such date as may be specified in the notification, the Board shall be dissolved: provided that no such declaration shall be made by the State Government, unless a resolution to that effect has been moved in and passed by the Mysore Legislative Assembly."

I want you to consider, I want you to convince me, when do you think that this clause will come into operation, I ask, when does this contingency arise, by which the Legislative Assembly shall say so by a resolution. What is the effect of this resolution and what is the effect of this provision? The effect of this is to set at naught a statute passed by this House. A Bill that is going to be an Act of the Legislature is going to be set at naught by a mere resolution of the Legislature. That is what is contemplated in Clause 78. Apart from the legal implications and the constitutional force, I want you to consider what is the meaning of such a provision? What is it that should take place? By a resolution of this House on a particular morning by a majority vote, evidently, if a resolution is passed, the Board shall cease to exist and that moment this whole Act is gone and this Board becomes *functus officio* and the assets and liabilities are transferred to the Government and Government is seized of the entire matter. I would like to say that should not be the ceremonious way, or shall I say, unceremonious way of dealing with a Bill of this kind. This refers to the dissolution of a body which is working on a statutory basis. When will that contingency arise? For one thing, the seven wise men—I was telling them Wordsworth's 'Seven'—, that is, one Chairman and six Members of the Board who are to be nominated—I will come to the word 'appointed' later—these seven men are responsible for finding money and getting on with the work of the Board and to execute the several schemes of betterment at every stage. But what is their power? Even borrowing is controlled by the

Government. But with the sanction of the Government, the Board can borrow on their own responsibility. And when appointments are made you say that even the Public Service Commission need not be consulted and in respect of appointments relating to Rs. 200 and more, such appointments can be made with the approval of the Government and if that approval is obtained, they need not abide by the direction of the Public Service Commission. That is the effect of the provisions, and that is the over-all control of the

4-30 P.M.

Government. If a contingency arises, this House would pass a resolution to dissolve it; that is the effect of the resolution. It is to set at naught the Mysore Housing Board. This Bill stands or falls upon that Board. As soon as the Board begins its function the Bill begins to work and when the Board ceases to work, the Bill is buried. By one resolution of this House you want to see that the Board ceases to function. What is the contingency that you expect to pass such a resolution? I will be very happy if I am corrected and if the Hon'ble the Law Minister should tell me the particular contingency arising in the usual course wherein such a resolution will have to be passed by this House. If I am convinced about that, I will be very happy to withdraw my remarks. This is one provision which I want the Government to consider. Taking by and large and taking the entire Bill, I feel strongly about the financial resources of the Government and the very formidable task that they are going to undertake. Hon'ble Member Sri Bheemappa Naik supported this Bill. I ask the Government, unless you make out a special case to make a special legislation to meet a contingency which cannot be met by any other law, unless such a contingency has arisen, I request Government to consider whether or not this stupendous task was too much and was beyond our Budget. I know with what enthusiasm several members have spoken preceding me. I do not want to damp the enthusiasm that they have expressed about this Bill. I am as enthusiastic as they are. But

something tells me, if it has to be worked, it has to be worked on rupees, annas and pies.

Sir, suggestions have been made in regard to the number of members of the Board and that seven may be raised to ten. After all, by the way in which you are filling the vacancies, the considerations must be entirely different.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Is it your idea that this Act must be made applicable only to the rural areas excluding urban areas since urban areas have got their own Act?

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—No, Sir. I must be very thankful to you for you have put that poser to me lest I may be said I have let them down here. I am very anxious that this Bill should be put into operation very effectively. But, if you can tell me, if you can give me an assurance in terms of rupees, annas and pies that you mean really business, I would be the first to vote for this Bill. My fear is, considering the financial position, it is not possible for Government to undertake this stupendous task and satisfy the crying needs of the rural parts which have got to be met. Sri P. R. Ramaiya used the phrase very aptly which I would like to repeat. He said: "You are not meeting even the fringe of the population by this Bill." Yes, that is a fact. You are not really giving housing facility to the poor and needy, who form, mark you, more than 90 per cent. In whatever form it may be, the effect would be to give more and more housing facilities to the urban population, and this duplication is unnecessary. The Trust Board Act is there. If necessary, such provisions that are essential may be incorporated in the Act of 1940. If you say that this Bill is brought for having a comprehensive Bill, this is not a comprehensive Bill, because alongside with this the other Acts would be there.

Therefore, I do not say that it should be restricted to the urban population. Give us an assurance here and now, not by mere words of mouth, but by carrying conviction to our hearts that you have got the wherewithal to put this Bill and really bring succour to the needy in the village parts. I am

(SRI K. PATTABHIRAMAN.)

afraid you have not been able to do so. I somehow am not in favour of saying that if this Bill was committed to the Select Committee, the Select Committee will alter the Bill suitably—I know what Sri Bheemappa Naik said, I am sure he never meant it. This Bill, by going to the Select Committee will not help us. One or two provisions of this Bill are no doubt very good and very nice; but doubtless there are a number of provisions which require pruning and modification and the House, if it is so desired, could send it to the Select Committee so that the members could bring to bear upon this Bill their wisdom, their own outlook and their own enlightenment. Subject to having this assurance, I say this Bill can go to the Select Committee; otherwise it is better if it is dropped.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What time does the Hon'ble the Minister require?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Ten minutes will be enough for me because I have already stated that it has to go to the Select Committee. I have conceded that and I do not want to take much time. I will answer only a few relevant points. I want to particularly dispel the pessimistic mood of some of my friends. That is all I want to do.

Sri K. PATTABHIRAMAN.—If the Hon'ble the Law Minister thought it was pessimism, he was grossly mistaken. It was optimism and I want to be optimistic. Please show you are optimistic. Then I shall be very happy and we will rejoice and dance with you.

ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಆರ್. ನಾಗಪ್ಪ ಶೆಟ್ಟಿ (ಶಿವಮೊಗ್ಗ).—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೇ, ನಾನು ಈಗ ಸಭೆಯ ಮುಂದೆ ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ಸ್ವಾಗತಿಸುತ್ತ ಕೇವಲ ಒಂದೆರಡು ವಿಷಯಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳಬೇಕೆಂದಿಟ್ಟುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇನೆ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಖ್ಯವಾಗಿರತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಬೆಟರ್ ಮೆಂಟ್ ಫೀಜ್ ಎಂಬತಕ್ಕದ್ದು. ಯಾರೋ ಒಬ್ಬರು ಸುಮಾರು ಇಲ್ಲಿಗೆ 10-20 ವರ್ಷಗಳ ಕೆಳಗೆ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾಳೆ ದಿವಸ ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ಅಂಥ ಒಂದು ಮನೆಯು ಪಕ್ಕದಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದು ಒಳ ಚರಂಡಿಯನ್ನೋ ಅಥವಾ ಒಂದು ರಸ್ತೆಯನ್ನೋ ಮಾಡಿಸಿದ್ದರಿಂದಲೇ ಆ ಮನೆಗೆ ಮೊದಲು 5 ಸಾವಿರ ಬೆರೆ ಇದ್ದುದು ಈಗ 8 ಸಾವಿರವರೆಗೂ ಏರಿ ಹೋಗಿರುತ್ತದೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಅದಕ್ಕೊಂದು ಬೆರೆಯನ್ನು ಸುಮ್ಮನೆ ಕಟ್ಟಿಬಿಟ್ಟು, ಅವರು ಯಾರಿಗೂ ಆ

ಮನೆಯನ್ನೇನೂ ಕೊಡುವುದಿಲ್ಲ, ಆದಾಗ್ಯೂ ಹಾಗೆ ಬೆರೆ ಜಾಸ್ತಿ ಬಂದಿರುವುದರಿಂದ, ಅದರಲ್ಲಿ ಸ್ವಲ್ಪ ಭಾಗದ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಡಿ ಎಂದು ಕೇಳಿದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಕೊಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಆಗುತ್ತದೆಯೇ? ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ರಸ್ತೆಗಳನ್ನು—ಚರಂಡಿಗಳ ಕೆಲಸಕಾರ್ಯಗಳನ್ನು ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರೇನೋ ಮಾಡಿಸತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ಸಹಜವಾಗಿಯೇ ಇದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಹೀಗೆ ಒಂದು ಫೀಜನ್ನು ಕೇಳತಕ್ಕ ವಿಚಾರವಾಸ್ತವ್ಯವಾದುದೇ ಆಗಿದ್ದರೂ—ಅದಕ್ಕೂ ಒಂದು ರೀತಿನವರೇ ರೀತಿಯಾಗಿ ಹೋಗಬೇಕು. ಆದರೆ ಹಾಗೆ ಯಾವ ಒಂದು ಕಾರಣವೂ ಇಲ್ಲದೆ ಇರುವಾಗ ಇಂಥ ಸಂದರ್ಭಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿ ಅರ್ಥ ಕೊಟ್ಟೇ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳತಕ್ಕದ್ದು ತುಂಬಾ ಅನ್ಯಾಯವಾಗುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಹಾಗೆ ಹೇಳುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೋದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾಮಳೆ ಅನೇಕ ಕೆರೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಲಾಗಿದೆ. ಆದರೆ ಈ ದಿವಸ ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ರಿವೇರಿ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲದಂತಾಗಿದೆ. ಅದೇ ರೀತಿ ತಾವು ಈ ದಿವಸ ಹೀಗೆ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ವಿಶೇಷವಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಹೊರಟಿರುವಾಗ ನಾಳೆ ಒಂದು ವೇಳೆ ಈ ಮನೆಗಳಿಗೆಲ್ಲಾ ಸುಣ್ಣ ಹೊಡೆಸಲಕ್ಕೂ ಕೂಡ ಆಗದೆ ಹೋಗಬಹುದು. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾದ್ಯಂತವೂ ಮನೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕಟ್ಟಿಸತಕ್ಕಂಥ ಒಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೈಗೊಂಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕಾಗಿ ಏಳು ಜನರ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾದ್ಯಂತವೂ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಗಳಲ್ಲೂ ಈ ಕಾರ್ಯವನ್ನು ನಡೆಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಇವರಿಗೆ ಬಂದಿತ ಸಾಧ್ಯವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ನಾನು ತಿಳಿದುಕೊಂಡಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ನಿವೇಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಹಂಚುವುದು, ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ತಯಾರುಮಾಡುವುದು ಇತ್ಯಾದಿ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಇವರು ಮಾಡುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ಆ ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳವರೂ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳ ಪ್ರತಿ ವರ್ಷದ ಆಯವ್ಯಯಗಳನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಅವರಿಗೆ ಬರುತ್ತಿರುವಂಥ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಬಹುಭಾಗ ಅವರಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕ ಪ್ರದೇಶಗಳಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಿವೇಶನಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾರಾಟಮಾಡುವುದರಿಂದ ಬರುತ್ತಿದೆಯೆಂಬುದಾಗಿ ಗೊತ್ತಾಗುತ್ತಿದೆ. ಈಗ ಇಂಥ ಸ್ಥಳಗಳಿಂದ ಬರತಕ್ಕ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿಯೆಲ್ಲಾ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ ಆಗ ಆ ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳ ಉತ್ಪತ್ತಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಕಡಮೆಯಾಗುತ್ತದೆ. ಅದುದರಿಂದ ಈ ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡಿನವರು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಸರಿಯಾದುದಲ್ಲ. ಆದರೆ ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾದ್ಯಂತ ಒಂದು ಪ್ಲಾನ್ ಬೇಕು, ಒಂದು ಮಾರ್ಗ ಇರಬೇಕು, ಒಂದು ನೀತಿ ಇರಬೇಕು ಎಂಬುದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನಾನೂ ಒಪ್ಪುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಪೌರಸಭೆಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಆಡಳಿತದ ವ್ಯವಸ್ಥೆ ಸರಿಯಾಗಿಲ್ಲದೆ, ಅಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ, ಉಪಾಧ್ಯಕ್ಷರೂ ಮತ್ತು ಚೀಫ್ ಆಫೀಸರೂ ತಮ್ಮ ಅಧಿಕಾರಗಳನ್ನು ದುರುಪಯೋಗಪಡಿಸಿಕೊಂಡು ಪ್ಲಾನನ್ನು ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಾರೆಂದು ಕಂಡುಬಂದಾಗ ಮಾತ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಆ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತಮ್ಮ ಕೈಗೆ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಂಡು ಆ ಕೆಲಸಗಳನ್ನು ನಡೆಸಬಹುದು. ಆದರೆ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರವನ್ನು ತಾವೇ ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳುತ್ತೇವೆ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳುವುದು ಸರಿಹೋಗಲಾರದು. ಅಲ್ಲದೆ ಈ ಬೋರ್ಡ್ ತನ್ನ ಹಣಕಾಸಿಗೆ ದಾನ, ಬಹುಮಾನ, ಗ್ರಾಂಟು, ಸಾಲ—ಇಂಥವುಗಳ ಮೇಲೆ ಅವಲಂಬಿಸುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆಂದೇ ಹೊರತು ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಯಾವುದೊಂದು ನಿಗದಿಯಾದ ಮೊಬಲಗು ಬರುವಂತೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೂ ಏರ್ಪಾಡು ಮಾಡಿಲ್ಲ. ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದಲಾಗಲಿ ಸ್ಥಳೀಯ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳಿಂದ

ರಾಗಲ, ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳಿಂದರಾಗಲ ಇಂತಿಷ್ಟು ನಿಗದಿ ಯಾಗಿ ಒಂದು ಗೊತ್ತಾದ percentage ರೂಪ ದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಅಥವಾ ಇನ್ನಾವುದಾದರೂ ರೂಪದಲ್ಲಿಯೇ ಹಣವನ್ನು ಬೋರ್ಡಿಗೆ ಸೇರಿಸಿ ಕೊಡುವ ಯೋಜನೆ ಯೂ ಕೂಡ ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಕಂಡುಬಂದಿಲ್ಲ. ಕೇಂದ್ರ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಈ ಹೊತ್ತು ಗ್ರಾಂಟನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತೇ ವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಹುದು, ನಾಳೆ ಇಲ್ಲವೆನ್ನಬಹುದು. ಮುಂದಿನ ವರ್ಷ ಸರ್ವೆಕ್ಷನ್ ಬಾರದೆ ಇದ್ದರೆ ಬೋರ್ಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವುದು ಹೇಗೆ? ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಏನಾದರೂ ಮೂಲ ಬಂಡವಾಳವನ್ನು ಒದಗಿಸಿ ಈ ಕಾನೂನನ್ನು ಜಾರಿಗೆ ತರಬೇಕೇ ಎನಿಸಿ, ಅದಿಲ್ಲದೆ ಜಾರಿಗೆತರುವುದು ಬಂಡವಾಳವಿಲ್ಲದೆ ವ್ಯಾಪಾರ ಮಾಡಿ ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ ಹಾಗಾಗುತ್ತದೆ.

ಈ ರೀತಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅನೇಕ ಲೋಪ ದೋಷಗಳಿವೆ. ಅವುಗಳನ್ನು ಲಾ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹಾಕುವುದು ನ್ಯಾಯ.

ಇದರಲ್ಲಿ ಇನ್ನೂ ಒಂದು ಲೋಪವಿದೆ. ಈ ಹೌಸಿಂಗ್ ಸ್ಕೀಮಿನಲ್ಲಿ ಒಂದೊಂದು ಜಿಲ್ಲೆಯನ್ನು ಒಂದು ಯೂನಿ ಟ್ಯಾಗಿ ಇಟ್ಟುಕೊಂಡು ಆದಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುವ ಯೋಜನೆ ಏನೂ ಕಾಣಬರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ! ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನಾದ್ಯಂತ ಎಲ್ಲಾ ಕಡೆಯಲ್ಲಿರುವ ನಿವೇಶನಗಳನ್ನೂ ತಾವೇ ಖರೀದಿ ಮಾಡುವುದು, ತಾವೇ ಅಕ್ವೈರ್ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು, ಮಾರುವುದು, ಆಸ್ತಿ ಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳುವುದು ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿರುವುದನ್ನು ನೋಡಿದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಕೈಕಳಿಗೆ ಇನ್ನೊಂದು ಸರ್ಕಾರವನ್ನು ರಚನೆ ಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಕಾಣ ಬರುತ್ತದೆ. ಇದೊಂದು ಸಬ್-ಸರ್ಕಾರ ವೆನ ಬಹುದು! ಆದ್ದರಿಂದ ಅಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಲೋಕಲ್ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳು, ಹೌಸ್ ಬ್ಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳು, ಲ್ಯಾಂಡ್ ಮಾರ್ಕೆಟಿಂಗ್ ಬ್ಯಾಂಕುಗಳು ಮುಂತಾದವುಗಳು ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಸಹಾಯ, ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಸಹಾಯ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡುವಂತೆ ಉತ್ತೇಜನ ಕೊಡಬೇಕೇ ಎನಿಸಿ ಅವರಲ್ಲಿರತಕ್ಕ ಸಂಪೂರ್ಣ ಅಧಿಕಾರ ತೆಗೆದು ಕೊಂಡು ನಾವೇ ಆದಳಿತ ನಡೆಸುತ್ತೇವೆನ್ನುವುದು ಸರಿಯಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಆದ್ದ ರಿಂದ ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋದಾಗ ಈ ಎಲ್ಲ ಲೋಪ ದೋಷಗಳನ್ನೂ ಸರಿಪಡಿಸಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಭಾಷಣವನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—There is not enough time. I think the Minister can reply.

Sri M. LINGANNA (Nanjangud).—There are so many members desirous of expressing their opinions. I think discussion may continue tomorrow also.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Tomorrow non-official business. There are only one or two members who want to speak. What do you say, Sri Ramachandra Rao?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Let the members speak. I would request them to be short.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We will hear Sri S. Gopala Gowda.

*ಶ್ರೀ ಎಸ್. ಗೋಪಾಲಗೌಡ (ಸಾಗರ-ಹೊಸ ನಗರ).—ಸ್ವಾಮಿ, ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಪಟ್ಟಾಭಿರಾಮಾಚಾರ್ಯರು ಮಾತನಾಡುತ್ತಾ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು

ಮಂಡಿಸಿರತಕ್ಕಂತೆ ಮಂತ್ರಿಗಳ ಉತ್ಸಾಹವನ್ನು ನಾನು ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಲ್ಲೆ, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಉದ್ದೇಶವನ್ನೂ ಕೂಡ ಅರ್ಥಮಾಡಿಕೊಳ್ಳಬಲ್ಲೆ, ಆದರೆ, ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಹಣಕಾಸಿನ ಪರಿಸ್ಥಿತಿ ಮತ್ತು ಈವರೆಗೂ ಕೆಲಸ ಆಗಿರುವುದು ಇದನ್ನೆಲ್ಲಾ ನೋಡಿ ದರೆ ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು,—ಅವರು 'ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ' ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ, ನಾನು 'ಅಗತ್ಯವಿಲ್ಲ' ಎಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೂ ಅವರು useless ಎಂಬ ಪದವನ್ನು ಉಪಯೋಗಿಸಲಿಲ್ಲ,—ಆದರೂ ಆ ಅರ್ಥ ಬರುವಂತೆ ಹೇಳಿದರು ನಾನು ಮುಂದುವರಿದು, ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಈಗಿರತಕ್ಕ ಅನೇಕ ಖಾಸಗಿ ಸಂಸ್ಥೆಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಲ್ಲುತ್ತದೆಂದು ಹೇಳಬಯಸುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಎರಡನೆಯದಾಗಿ ಎರಡು ಲಕ್ಷ ರೂಪಾಯಿಗಳ ಒಂದು ಖರ್ಚನ್ನು ಆಹ್ವಾನಿಸುತ್ತದೆ. ಜೊತೆಗೆ ನಾಮಕರಣ ನಡೆಸಲು ಏಳು ಜನರನ್ನು, ಅದನ್ನೂ ಅವರ ಭಾಷೆಯಲ್ಲೇ ಹೇಳುವುದಾದರೆ, ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಇಷ್ಟಕ್ಕೆ ಮನಸ್ಸಿಗೆ ಹೊಂದಿಕೊಂಡು ಕೆಲಸಮಾಡತಕ್ಕ ಏಳು ಜನರನ್ನು ನೇಮಿಸುವ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಇವರಲ್ಲಿ ಎಷ್ಟು ಜನ ರನ್ನು, ಯಾವಾಗ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಬದಲಾವಣೆ ಮಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಕಾಶ ಸರ್ಕಾರಕ್ಕೆ! ಇಂಥ ಮಸೂದೆ ಯಿಂದ ಹೆಚ್ಚಿನ ಕೆಲಸವಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಇನ್ನೂ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯನ್ನು ನೋಡುತ್ತಾ ಹೋದರೆ ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಎರಡು ಮೂರು ದಿವಸ ಬೇಕಾದರೂ ಮಾತನಾಡಬಹುದು. ಹತ್ತು ನಿಮಿಷಗಳಲ್ಲಿ ಮುಗಿಸಬೇಕಾಗಿರುವುದರಿಂದ ಕೆಲವು ಮಾತುಗಳನ್ನು ಮಾತ್ರ ಹೇಳುತ್ತೇನೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆಯ ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ 'dissolution of the Board' ಎಂದಿದೆ, ಅದನ್ನು ಮಾಡಿಬಿಟ್ಟರೆ ಇದರ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯೇ ಇರುವುದಿಲ್ಲ. ಒಂದು ಗೃಹ ನಿರ್ಮಾಣ ಯೋಜನೆ ಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದರೆ ಯಾರಾದರೂ ಮಹನೀಯರು ತಾವಾಗಿಯೇ ಮುಂದೆ ಬಂದು ಯೋಜನೆಯನ್ನು ಕೊಡುತ್ತಾರೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದಲ್ಲಿ ಏನು ಹಣವಿದೆ? ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಗಳೂ ಕಾರ್ಪೊರೇಷನ್‌ಗಳೂ, ಹೌಸ್ ಬ್ಲಿಂಗ್ ಕೋ-ಆಪರೇಟಿವ್ ಸೊಸೈಟಿಗಳೂ ಈ ವಿಷಯದಲ್ಲಿ ಬೇಕಾದಷ್ಟು ಸೇವೆ ಮಾಡುತ್ತಿವೆ. ಹೀಗಿರುವಾಗ ಏಳು ಜನರನ್ನು ತೃಪ್ತಿಪಡಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಒಂದು ಬೋರ್ಡು ಮಾಡಿ, ಈ ನಾಟಕವನ್ನಾಡುವುದಕ್ಕೆ ಅವಶ್ಯಕತೆಯಿಲ್ಲ. ಅದಾದ ರಿಂದ ಸರ್ಕಾರದವರು ಗೌರವದಿಂದ ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಯನ್ನು ವಾಪಸು ತೆಗೆದುಕೊಳ್ಳಬೇಕೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿ ನನ್ನ ಮಾತನ್ನು ಮುಗಿಸುತ್ತೇನೆ.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Can this Bill be taken up after non-official resolutions? Unless the House is prepared to take it up after two days...

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Most of the Members have spoken, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Or, they must be prepared to sit after Five of the Clock.

Sri A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.—It is difficult, Sir. I am of opinion that the general debate must go on. It is an important Bill. The general opinion of all the Hon'ble Members must be placed before the House before it is

(SRI A. BHEEMAPPA NAIK.)

sent to a Select Committee. Whether it is necessary to send this to the Select Committee.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಬಿ. ಎ. ಮೂಡಲಗಿರಿ ಗೌಡ.—ಮಾನ್ಯ ಸದಸ್ಯರು ಈಗತಾನೆ, ನಾಳೆ ಬಾಸಗಿ ಕಾರ್ಯಕರಾಪಕಳಿವೆ, ಇದನ್ನು ನಾಳೆ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದಕ್ಕಾಗುವುದಿಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ಅಪ್ಪಣೆ ಕೊಡಿಸಿದರು.....

ಶ್ರೀ ಎ. ಜಿ. ರಾಮಚಂದ್ರರಾವ್.—ಈಗ ಸರ್ಕಾರದ ಪರವಾಗಿ ಸಚಿವರು ಉತ್ತರ ಕೊಡಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಇದಕ್ಕೆ ಕಾಲಬೇಕೆಂದು ತಾವು ಹೇಳಿದಿರಿ. ಇದರ ಮೇಲೆ ಮಾತ್ರ ಇದನ್ನೇ ಮುಂದುವರಿಸುವುದರಲ್ಲಿ ಯಾವ ಅರ್ಥವೂ ಇಲ್ಲವೆಂದು ನಾನು ಹೇಳಬೇಕಾಗಿದೆ. ಈ ಮಸೂದೆ ಸಾಕಷ್ಟು ಚರ್ಚೆಯಾಗಿದೆ; ಅನೇಕರು ಮಾತನಾಡಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಸಲಹೆಗಳು ಬಂದಿವೆ. ಅನೇಕ ಕ್ಲಾಜುಗಳ ವಿಚಾರ ಗಮನಕ್ಕೆ ತಂದಿದ್ದಾರೆ. ನಾನು ಮೊದಲೇ ಇದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗುವುದು ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದೇನೆ. ಬಹುಶಃ ಶ್ರೀಮಾನ್ ಗೋಪಾಲ ಗೌಡರನ್ನು ಬಿಟ್ಟು ಮಿಕ್ಕಲ್ಲರೂ ಇದು ಸೆರೆಕ್ಸ್ ಕಮಿಟಿಗೆ ಹೋಗಿ, ಲೇಔಟ್‌ನಲ್ಲಿ ರಹಿತವಾಗಿ ಬಂದರೆ ಸೂಕ್ತವೆಂದು ಹೇಳಿದ್ದಾರೆ.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Are you replying?

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Yes, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—We shall hear Sri Rama Rao and then you may reply.

Sri D. DEVARAJA URS (Hunsur).—We want to know whether we are going to finish with the Bill today. Otherwise there will be many more Hon'ble Members who wish to speak and we do not know up to what time we are going to sit.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—What is your opinion?

Sri D. DEVARAJA URS.—I have no opinion to give. The point is: You were pleased to remark before Sri Gopala Gowda spoke that ten minutes would be given to him, with a view to facilitate the Bill being referred to a Select Committee. Now, if again discussion is allowed, we do not know what time the discussions will take place on this Bill. That must be decided. If the Chair gives a ruling that it will be taken up some other day, I have no objection.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I must also know what the opinion of the House is in this matter. If the House is anxious to continue discussion after non-official business is over, that is two days after,—for tomorrow and the day

after are allotted for non-official business,—I think I have to give a ruling according to the opinion of the House. So I would like to know what the opinion of the House is.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA (Turuvekere).—In case you give a chance to Sri Rama Rao, it must be taken up on some other day. It must be taken up only on that day.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That is not correct. Whether I give a chance to Sri Rama Rao or not, it is a different matter. The Minister says that he is going to refer it to the Select Committee. So it does not need much time.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—Sir, the usual procedure with regard to Bills is this. Every member must have a chance to take part in the discussion. There is no time limit. Discussion can be cut short or curtailed only if there is a closure motion. No closure motion has so far been moved and accepted. So, I think, discussion on this Bill must go on. I think this is a matter of privilege and it cannot be curtailed. So, when we are already wanting in time, the best thing would be to take up this Bill on another day.

Sri B. HUTCHE GOWDA.—But Sri Rama Rao is ready to speak now.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I have allowed him to speak today.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—In that case I will continue my speech. I was under the impression that the Bill would be over today, as it will be referred to a Select Committee. Otherwise, I would not have left it at the stage at which I stopped.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—If you are anxious to complete this Bill today, let us see.

Sri S. GOPALA GOWDA.—I am not anxious.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—For Sri Rama Rao, ten minutes is hardly sufficient. He will not even complete his introduction.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Then, in that case, I would like to know the opinion of the House before giving my ruling—whether it is willing to continue discussion after the non-official business is over.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—This is a very important Bill.

(**SRI M. MADIAH** rose.)

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—After Sri Rama Rao speaks, unless it is a point of order. You will have a chance to speak after Sri Rama Rao. Let him make his suggestion.

Sri M. MADIAH (Nanjangud-Scheduled Castes).—On a point of order, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Point of order? What is it?

Sri M. MADIAH.—It is this. Today is the last day for official business; unless Government want another day for official business we cannot go on with this Bill after two days. Afterwards, there is no programme so far as the work of the Assembly is concerned.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Under what section or provision of the rules you say that?

Sri M. MADIAH.—The programme for the session. The last day is the 14th, according to the programme. Unless Government want to transact official business on another day, today is the last day.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I understand the Hon'ble Member. But there is no point of order.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO (Tumkur).—I only wish to say that it does not appear to me that the debate on this Bill would be expected to close by this evening. As a matter of fact I did rise several times but it happened that I could not catch the eye of the Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—That is why I thought of giving you a chance though I wished to give it to Sri Gopala Gowda. I will give him chance finally.

***Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.**—Although many Hon'ble Members have spoken on this Bill, I can assure my esteemed friend the Hon'ble the Minister for Law that without intending to delay the progress of the Bill or legislation, he will find that any little further time that may be spent on the general debate of this Bill would be usefully spent, because I shall be able to point him, if ever there is an opportunity, that in dovetailing the Labour Housing Act of 1949 with the Housing Board Bill which we will hereafter enact into law,

we shall perhaps be working at cross-purposes with the objectives of both the legislative measures and it would be very desirable that some of these points are specifically stated, so that the Select Committee to which the Bill will go may be in a position to consider them pointedly. What unfortunately has happened on more than one occasion is that when a general debate takes place on the motion for consideration of a Bill which is afterwards referred to the Select Committee, some of the points that have been made during the course of the general debate are for some reason or other lost sight of, during the intensive work that is carried on in the Select Committee to which the Bill gets referred; and I may state that in the case of the Sales Tax Bill Select Committee, after I made a speech on the floor of this House, I put down five specific points in writing and addressed a letter to the Chairman of the Select Committee to which that Bill was referred. I understand from Hon'ble Members of this Select Committee that that letter has not come before the Select Committee and though I have absolutely no desire to refer to anything that may have transpired in the meetings of the Select Committee, I do wish to state that in Select Committees of legislative Bills, any points that have been specified for consideration by the Select Committee should be considered, whatever may be the conclusions to which the Select Committee may choose to come. And therefore . . .

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—May I point out, Sir, that reference to the transactions in the Select Committee are not proper because they are treated as confidential. I may submit that the Select Committee has not finished its labours. It is still going on.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—I think the proceedings of the Select Committee, till the report of the Select Committee is presented to this House, are not to be disclosed at this stage.

Sri M. V. RAMA RAO.—I am not referring to the proceedings of the Select Committee at all. I was merely referring to the fate of a letter which

(SRI M. V. RAMA RAO.)

I had addressed to the Hon'ble Chairman of the Select Committee and the Law Minister. I have no desire to refer to the proceedings of the Select Committee on this Bill or other Bills. What I was stating was that points have either to be stated on the floor of the House so that they may be considered by the Select Committee or they have to be stated otherwise in writing a letter addressed to the Chairman of the Select Committee. If either of these two courses of action is not available to those who wish to participate in the discussion of the Bill, it would be difficult to improve any legislative measure; and in so far as the matter pertains to the Housing Board Bill, I am sure no Hon'ble Member will dispute that the Bill is such an important measure that any further time spent upon that with a view to stating the points that may be usefully considered by the Select Committee, would be time usefully spent. And therefore I suggest, Sir, that some time may be provided for the debate on the Bill before it goes to the Select Committee.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Of course, there may be two or three speakers and they may require one or two hours.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—Tomorrow and the day after we have non-official business.

Sri J. MOHAMED IMAM.—According to the present programme the session concludes on the 14th. I would like to know the order of the programme.

Sri K. HANUMANTHAIYA (Leader of the House).—I will state something about it tomorrow, Sir.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—Can we postpone the discussion on this Bill without fixing up the date? That is the difficulty.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—It may be provisionally fixed for Thursday.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—According to the present programme which has been already circulated, the House will only sit till 14th; 15th we have not decided. So, if the Leader of the House is prepared to accept to continue it on the 15th, it can be continued.

Sri A. G. RAMACHANDRA RAO.—We can provisionally take it that this can be taken up on the 15th.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER.—So, now the House will rise for the day and meet tomorrow at 8-30 A.M.

The House adjourned at Five Minutes past Five of the Clock to meet at Thirty Minutes past Eight of the Clock on Tuesday, the 13th April 1954.
